ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/1/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER 261
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO.(S). 8086
3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

4. AUTHOR(S): Gustad, John W.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: The Career Decisions of College Teachers

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Southern Regional Edu. Board Research Monograph Series No. 2

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. SREB
ST. 130 Sixth St., NW
CITY, ST. Atlanta , Ga.
TELE. EXT
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Southern Regional Education Board

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	60	48

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Survey Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

higher education	retention	chemistry		
teachers	colleges	language arts		
careers	psychology			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

This study, designed to ascertain the reasons for entering and leaving the field of college or university teaching, was limited to white males in southern colleges and to the subject fields of chemistry, English, and psychology. It was conducted among employed teachers, former teachers, and graduate students by means of carefully constructed questionnaires and depth interviews.

The report of this study discusses its background, methods used, analysis of life histories, job activities and reward systems, personnel practices, and implications for action. Included are extensive correlative tables. Appendixes include a list of participating institutions, the interview outline, sample questionnaires, and numerous tables.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT: Reporter No. 6

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OF PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

F

#8 R-6-9

8086

THE CAREER DECISIONS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

By John W. Gustad

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

SREB RESEARCH MONOGRAPH SERIES NO. 2

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD / ATLANTA NOVEMBER, 1960

SREB

ED000261

THE CAREER DECISIONS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

By John W. Gustad

SREB RESEARCH MONOGRAPH SERIES NO. 2

Copyright© 1960 • Southern Regional Education Board • 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta 13, Georgia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter One: A Non-Technical Summary 5
Chapter Two: Background of the Study 9
Chapter Three: Methods 12
Chapter Four: Analysis of Life Histories 15
Chapter Five: Job Activities and Reward Systems 24
Chapter Six: Personnel Policies and Practices: The Conditions of Work 36
Chapter Seven: Miscellaneous Matters 42
Chapter Eight: Some Implications for Action 47
Appendix A: Participating Institutions 49
Appendix B: Interview Outline 51
Appendix C: Sample Questionnaires 55
Appendix D: Tables 79

INDEX OF TABLES

Page

Table 1 Summary of Faculty Members' Questionnaire Returns 14
Table 2 Number of Administrators' Questionnaires Returned 14
Table 3 Number of Interviews Conducted 14
Table 4 Sample of Questionnaires Used in Data Analysis 14
Table 5 Age and Family Status of Present and Former Teachers 16
Table 6 Birthplaces of Present and Former Teachers and of Their Parents . 16
Table 7 Family Backgrounds of Present and Former Teachers 16
Table 8 Family Backgrounds of Present and Former Teachers 17
Table 9 Home Influences and Attitudes Toward School 17
Table 10 Education and Birthplace of Present and Former Teachers' Wives . 18
Table 11 Religious Backgrounds and Preferences of Present and Former Teachers 19
Table 12 Educational Background of Present and Former Teachers . . . 19
Table 13 Class Standing and Honors of Present and Former Teachers . . . 20
Table 14 Social Activities during Secondary School, College and Graduate School of Present and Former Teachers 20
Table 15 Current Social Activities of Present and Former Teachers . . . 21
Table 16 Time and Influence Factors Involved in the Decision to Teach . . 21
Table 17 Influences on Career Choices of Present and Former Teachers . . 22
Table 18 Employment Histories (Teaching Record) 22
Table 19 Comparisons of Highest Ranked Reward Values 25
Table 20 Intercorrelations Among Selected Reward Value Categories . . . 26
Table 21 Comparative Analysis of Reward Value Structures 27
Table 22 Faculty Reward Values as Reported by Administrators 27

Page

Table 23 Intercorrelations Among Reward Value Response Conditions as Rated by Administrators 28
Table 24 Comparison of Faculty and Administration Ratings of Values in a Teaching Career 28
Table 25 Values and Rewards of Teaching Career Listed by Present Teachers 29
Table 26 Values and Rewards of Teaching Career Listed by Former Teachers 29
Table 27 Comparisons of Highest Ranked Job Activities by Major Field . . 30
Table 28 Intercorrelations Among Selected Activities Scales 31
Table 29 Faculty Job Activities as Reported by Administrators 32
Table 30 Intercorrelations of Administrators' Ratings of Faculty Activities . 32
Table 31 Comparisons Between Faculty and Administrator Ratings of Activities 33
Table 32 Professional and Scholarly Activities Listed by Present and Former Teachers 34
Table 33 Occupational Roles and Reactions of Present and Former Teachers 34
Table 34 Comparison of Fringe Benefits Available to Present and Former Teachers 36
Table 35 Available Fringe Benefits as Reported by Administrators 37
Table 36 Teaching Loads Reported by Present and Former Teachers in Each Major Field 37
Table 37 Percent of Present and Former Teachers in Each Field Reporting Available Financial Support for Research 37
Table 38 Extent of Participation in Decision-Making 37
Table 39 Rating of Administrative Climate by Present and Former Teachers 38
Table 40 Rating of Several Aspects of Faculty Independence 38
Table 41 Extent to Which Work Adjustments Are Made for Certain Special Duties 39
Table 42 Rating of Work Conditions by Present Teachers 39
Table 43 Rating of Work Conditions by Former Teachers 39
Table 44 Rating of Work Conditions by Administrators 40
Table 45 Institutional Policies Affecting Faculty Members as Reported by Administrators 40
Table 46 Teachers' Perceptions of the Status of Their Profession 42
Table 47 Variables Affecting Present Teachers' Plans to Stay in Teaching . . 42
Table 48 Variables Affecting Former Teachers' Decision About Teaching . . 42
Table 49 Career Plans of Present and Former Teachers 43
Table 50 Occupational Goals of College and University Teachers 44
Table 51 Goal Attainment of College and University Teachers 44
Table 52 Goals of Former Teachers 44
Table 53 Formal Training for Teaching 45
Table 54 Geographical Preferences 45
Table 55 Formal Job Offers Received in Previous Year by Source 46
Table 56 Informal Job Offers Received in Previous Year by Source . . . 46

APPENDIX D TABLES

		Page
Table I	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University Chemistry Teachers	79
Table II	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Chemistry Teachers	79
Table III	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College Chemistry Teachers	79
Table IV	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College Chemistry Teachers	80
Table V	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University English Teachers	80
Table VI	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University English Teachers	80
Table VII	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College English Teachers	81
Table VIII	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College English Teachers	81
Table IX	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University Psychology Teachers	81
Table X	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Psychology Teachers	82
Table XI	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College Psychology Teachers	82
Table XII	Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Psychology Teachers	82
Table XIII	Job Activities of Present University Chemistry Teachers	83
Table XIV	Job Activities of Former University Chemistry Teachers	83
Table XV	Job Activities of Present College Chemistry Teachers	83
Table XVI	Job Activities of Former College Chemistry Teachers	84
Table XVII	Job Activities of Present University English Teachers	84
Table XVIII	Job Activities of Former University English Teachers	84
Table XIX	Job Activities of Present College English Teachers	85
Table XX	Job Activities of Former College English Teachers	85
Table XXI	Job Activities of Present University Psychology Teachers	85
Table XXII	Job Activities of Former University Psychology Teachers	86
Table XXIII	Job Activities of Present College Psychology Teachers	86
Table XXIV	Job Activities of Former College Psychology Teachers	86

The Career Decisions of College Teachers

A Report of Research in the Southern Region

by

John W. Gustad, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
Alfred University

Formerly, Professor of Psychology and
Director, Counseling Center
University of Maryland

With the Assistance of
Bernard G. Berenson
and
Phil Welsh
University of Maryland

* * *

A Cooperative Research Project
Sponsored Jointly by the
Southern Regional Education Board
and
University of Maryland

* * *

College Park, Maryland
1960

I teach because I am a teacher. It is an ancient and honorable profession and the only one where I would feel comfortable. For professional teachers are like saints in that they can't help being what they are. (Any other resemblances are purely coincidental.)

Professor F. Earl Ward
Macalester College *Bulletin*
Alumni Number, February, 1958

Acknowledgments

In a very real sense, this was a cooperative study, made possible in part by funds granted by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The statements made and views expressed are solely my responsibility. It could not have been done, however, without the active support and assistance of many individuals. I wish that it were possible to thank individually every person who contributed to the study, but it is not. A few can be identified by name; the rest will, I hope, understand the problem and accept this brief statement in the spirit of deep gratitude intended.

Special thanks are due to:

The staff members of the Southern Regional Education Board, especially to Drs. Robert C. Anderson, A. J. Brumbaugh, John K. Folger, and Winfred L. Godwin. Considerable clerical assistance, and much good advice came from the SREB.

The administration of the University of Maryland, especially to President Wilson H. Elkins, Executive Vice-President Albin O. Kuhn, and Dean Leon P. Smith of the College of Arts and Sciences. The university arranged for me to be relieved of other duties so that I might conduct this research, provided office space, and served as the administrative agency for the grant.

The members of the Committee on Psychological Research Personnel and Facilities of the Southern Regional Education Board. This committee, of which I had the honor to be chairman, consisted of the following: Drs. James C. Dixon, University of Florida; M. Curtis Langhorne, Emory University; Stanley B. Williams, College of William and Mary. Dr. Irwin A. Berg, Louisiana State University, joined the committee during the study and provided much valuable advice.

The staff of the project which consisted of Mr. Bernard G. Berenson, Research Associate, and Mr. Phil Welsh, Research Assistant. Their imaginative hard work contributed more than can be acknowledged. In addition, Mrs. Mary L. Mautino, project secretary, proved to be an exceptionally able and willing worker who added much to the study.

The individuals who assisted me in the interviewing phase of the project. They were: Drs. Bernard M. Bass, Gwendolyn S. Dickson, Paul E. Eiserer, Searles A. Grossman, Norma R. Metzner, and A. H. Tuma. These very able and busy individuals responded to my urgent appeal for assistance, took time from their other duties to conduct interviews, and thereby added immeasurably to the research.

The administrative officers of the colleges and universities that agreed to participate in the study. Thanks are due especially to the presidents of those institutions which agreed to permit visits for the purpose of conducting interviews. These were:

Belmont College, Nashville, Tennessee
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee
George Peabody College for Teachers,
  Nashville, Tennessee
Hood College, Frederick, Maryland
Howard University, Washington, D. C.
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
  Maryland
Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro,
  Tennessee
Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland
Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos, Texas
Towson State Teachers College,
  Towson, Maryland
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland
University of Texas, Austin, Texas
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee

The many present and former teachers and graduate students who took the time to provide the basic data on which this report is based. We realized when we constructed our data collection instruments that we were asking a great deal from busy people. It can only be hoped that, understanding why the study was done as it was, they will feel that their time was well spent.

Those other investigators of the faculty personnel problems who generously shared their experiences with us. They were: Drs. Theodore Caplow, Ruth E. Eckert, and John E. Stecklein of the University

of Minnesota and Reece J. McGee of the University of Texas.

My wife, Ruth, and daughter, Ann, who endured without complaint the considerable disruption of our lives created by the extended visits to conduct interviews and the pressures and tensions brought on by the inevitable frustrations, deadlines, and worry about deadlines that are a part of research that deals with human beings. Their support and encouragement were immeasurable and invaluable.

To all of these who made this study possible, I am profoundly grateful.

While the advice of others was extremely helpful, the opinions and conclusions expressed in this report are my own, and are not necessarily those of the Southern Regional Education Board or of the University of Maryland.

J. W. G.

College Park, Maryland
July 20, 1959

Chapter One

A Non-Technical Summary

IT IS AXIOMATIC in the field of personnel management that policies and practices must, if they are to have the desired effects, take into account the characteristics of the individuals and groups for whom they are designed. For many years, higher education has provided industry and governmental agencies with consultants on personnel management. It is astounding that so little has been done to apply the knowledge gained from research to the personnel practices of higher education itself. One reason for this is that there has been comparatively little research done on the campuses which would provide the facts and theoretical frameworks needed to improve personnel management in higher education.

If people are to be attracted into college teaching, and those retained for whom such a career is appropriate, the reasons for entering and leaving teaching must be known. It was to provide some of the needed information about these questions that this research was undertaken.

Out of a number of meetings of the Committee on Psychological Personnel, a committee of the SREB's Council on Psychological Resources in the South, there came a proposal to study the choice of college teaching as a career for psychologists. The SREB Research Advisory Committee, meeting in the spring of 1957, decided to support this research. Staff members of SREB suggested that it be broadened to include other disciplines so that the results might have broader implications. This modification was agreed to, and two other fields, chemistry and English, were added. Reasons for the selection of these three disciplines are included in chapter 3. Briefly, there were two major considerations: (1) they represent fairly well the three major curricular areas of the arts and science college; (2) they differ widely in terms of non-teaching job opportunities available to their members.[1]

Within each field, three classes of individuals were studied: presently employed teachers in the region; former college teachers; and graduate students. Data were collected by two methods: a carefully designed and pretested questionnaire and, for a sub-group, semi-structured interviews at some depth.

The present report contains the analyses of data obtained from three sources: (1) presently employed college teachers; (2) former college teachers who had left teaching for other positions; (3) administrators. The report is restricted to white, male college and university teachers. Data for women, graduate students, teachers college and technological institution faculty members, and Negroes have yet to be analyzed. Returns from these groups were much poorer, and there are many fewer of them in college teaching.

The study was concerned with obtaining answers to two principal questions: (1) why do some individuals choose to become college teachers, and (2) why do some of these later decide to leave teaching for other positions? It turned out that the first was the easier of the two, contrary to popular opinion.

They become college teachers because of the kinds of people they are.[2] They are, first of all, highly intelligent. However, many intelligent people elect fields other than college teaching. They are also typically middle-class in background. This is important, because middle-class families encourage the development of certain powerful attitudes toward self and life work.

A sense of responsibility, ambition, a desire for achievement, and the idea that self-improvement and hard work are the paths to these, dominate the value systems of most middle-class families. Quite naturally, the individual reared in such a home tends to interiorize these values and goals. Another important feature of the middle-class value system is willingness to sublimate immediate desires in favor of long-range attainments.

Even these value systems, however, important as they are, do not quite account for the development of the kind of individual who will, when faced with the opportunity, elect college teaching as a career. Another variable, one which will modify the value system significantly, is needed. After all, most sons from middle-class homes choose careers in which money and what it can provide are the principal goals. Some choose careers in which service plays a large role—such as medicine—but few elect careers as monetarily unrewarding as teaching or the ministry.

This other variable seems to be—regardless of the dynamics underlying it—a developed preference for essentially solitary and intellectually stimulating activities. The interviews in particular brought this to light. Many of these present and former teachers reported that, quite early in their lives, they became bookworms or enthusiasts for nature study, chemistry sets, electronics and the like. Being intellectually able, they soon left their peers behind and found that they were pursuing their activities in isolation.

Such isolation from the peer group has its consequences. Removed from the effects of the peer group on value formation, they had to develop their own values. Finding intellectual stimulation rewarding, they chose a way of life which provides the maximum of this. They seek out situations in which their abilities can bring them into contact with exciting ideas and tasks.

Their school histories are also relevant. Being intellectually superior and having the middle-class values that place a premium on hard work and achievement, they normally do exceptionally well in school. For this, they are rewarded by parents and teachers. School becomes a very rewarding situation and teachers, who hold the keys to the kingdom of discovery and knowledge, are looked up to and internalized as adult role models.

---

[1] Somewhat similar studies in philosophy and zoology are now underway, supported by the New England Board of Higher Education.

[2] This chapter follows closely the article by the present writer, They March to a Different Drummer: Another Look at College Teachers, which appeared in the *Educational Record*, 1959, 40, No. 3, pp. 204-211.

When one leaves the herd and browses in what seem to be greener pastures, an interesting circular effect is set up. The herd closes ranks to prevent easy re-entry of the wanderer. Children, and particularly adolescents, are intolerant of deviation. Being unsure of themselves, they have to label differences as deficiencies. Thus, having left the herd, perhaps only briefly at first, the individual encounters resistance when he tries to return. Perhaps, also, he cannot pledge to devote himself exclusively to the things the peer group values most.

The result is that, finding re-entry difficult, he pursues his solitary course more and more. The more he does so, the more his values are different, the less able is he to chatter glibly about the favorite topics. By adolescence, the differences are marked, and the course has been set.

Because he finds school rewarding (or at least learning, for many said that school, with its lock-step geared to the less able student, was often dull) and because education is valued in the middle-class as the best way to achieve "success," he goes on further and further. Because the activities of his peers—so often centered around making money—do not appeal to him as much as learning and discovery, he recoils to some extent from entering the labor market when most do.

Instead, he goes on to graduate work, often without any clear idea about why. Here, the value systems he has developed are even more rewarding, for he finds himself surrounded with like-minded individuals in larger numbers, and he also finds teachers who, unlike those in high school and even in college, can challenge him and also lead him into exciting paths.

Somewhere in graduate school, he is frequently given an opportunity to teach, perhaps at first as an assistant. The dynamics underlying the appeal of teaching (much, apparently, like preaching) will not be considered here. Suffice it to say that, for many, this experience is rewarding. When the question is raised, along in the last year before graduation, about what he shall do (now that there are no more degrees to garner) to earn a living, it is not surprising that this individual should choose teaching, even in preference to lucrative positions in industry or government. After all, it is in school that he has found his greatest rewards and his greatest acceptance. His teachers, especially those in college and graduate school, have come to be important models, men who lead lives in which they can and often do find outlets for the values they hold dearest.

By and large, however, entry into teaching is the end product of drift. That is, the majority do not engage in the kind of career planning that is typical of the aspiring physician or attorney. But to say that it is drift is *not* to say that the decision is one of chance. It is rather to say that this individual, even though he may not usually have thought much about it, will, when faced with the decision, choose that alternative that is most compatible to him because he is the kind of person he is.

In summary, then, the person who becomes a college teacher may be described in general as follows:

> He is highly intelligent.
>
> He comes from a middle-class home in which responsibility, upward mobility, achievement, and hard work are valued.
>
> He develops early in life a preference for largely solitary and intellectually stimulating activities in preference to the goals characteristic of his peers.

It is not surprising that this individual accepts an opportunity to join the faculty when it is offered to him. For him the educational world has become a place compatible with his values and interests and accepts his typical preferences over those of his peers.

Before turning to the other question, why do some of these individuals later decide to leave teaching, a few comments about the decision process seem relevant.

Typically, the decision about the major field of interest comes a good bit earlier than the decision about how to use the knowledge. For those in chemistry and English, the field is most frequently selected during the high school or early college years. Psychologists usually make their field selection later, perhaps because this subject is not ordinarily taught in high school, perhaps because the maturity required to examine human behavior objectively does not develop until relatively late. For all three groups, however, the decision to enter teaching comes somewhat later, quite often during the later stages of graduate training. As noted above, the entry process appears to be the end product of drift with little or no attempt being made in most cases to guide able students in the direction of teaching. It is impossible to estimate how many potentially able college teachers are lost through this haphazard recruitment process. The number is probably large. Considering the present and anticipated shortages of teachers, it would appear to be high time to look into better guidance and recruitment practices.

Replies to the question about who most influenced the decision to teach showed some interesting differences among the three fields. The chemists and those in English most often mentioned a teacher, sometimes at the secondary, sometimes at the college level. The psychologists were less inclined to attribute much influence to anyone, perhaps because they are by training less willing to consider relatively simple cause and effect relations in human affairs, perhaps because they are older when they make the decision and therefore less susceptible to such influences. In any event, teachers do seem to be important role models who should, if we are to interest more able students in teaching, be encouraged to exercise their influence to its maximum advantage.

The question as to why some teachers later abandon teaching for non-teaching positions is more difficult to answer. Money is frequently cited as a major reason, and it certainly is a factor. However, it is not the sole answer, nor even the most important one. It seems fair to say that, *while large amounts of additional funds are needed immediately, the personnel problems of higher education would remain substantially the same even if unlimited funds were available.* It was disturbing to encounter the large number of administrators at all levels who are, in effect, sitting on their hands and complaining that nothing can be done until the millennium of increased budgets arrives.

The movement out of college teaching is doubly tragic in that the impression gained was that a disproportionately large number of better teachers are included in the group that has left. This study was not concerned with the quality of teaching personnel, largely because no widely accepted measure or definition of this quality exists. However, comments from present and former teachers and such admittedly secondary cues as the number of publications and activity in professional and scientific organizations credited to those who have left lead to the conclusion that we are losing many who should not be lost.

The other disturbing feature of the movement out of teaching is that most of the former teachers would have preferred to remain and left only when their situations became intolerable. Most of the former teachers were, in effect, driven from teaching. At a time when education is perhaps the key to national survival, this should not be permitted to continue.

Some individuals who enter the field should not continue in it because they do not have the characteristics required of good faculty members. Some turnover as these people leave must always be expected. It is not possible to estimate the numbers of these individuals, but it is probably not large. College teaching, like so many occupations, has such broad tolerance limits with respect to the kinds of individuals who can succeed in it that it is likely that most of those who enter it can (or could if attention were paid to the problem) find a position in which they can achieve success and satisfaction.

Interestingly, the same set of data seems to reflect the reasons for remaining in teaching as well as for leaving it. The answer to this paradox may be seen in the data having to do with reward values in particular, to some extent in the data on job activities.

Before turning to those, however, brief consideration needs to be given to the matter of occupational role identification. Generally speaking, there were three major possibilities: identification with the discipline, with the activity of teaching, and with the institution. In many cases, men had all three, but normally, one was predominant. In only a very few cases were these men identified with the institution. Most identified either with the discipline or with teaching.

Identification with the discipline seems especially interesting. This is so because there seems to be a trend toward taking distribution of available rewards out of the hands of the institutions and transferring it to the disciplines. That is, many of these men feel, quite rightly, that the best route to the top is through identification with the discipline. They set out to acquire visibility and acceptance among their disciplinary peers. This means publishing and being active in association affairs. Having attained such visibility and acceptance, the men become candidates for positions elsewhere on nomination of leaders in their fields who know little or nothing about such on-campus behavior as their teaching. These offers can be taken to the dean or president who then must either promote the man to hold him or lose him to another institution. This "dynamiting" is a familiar story to most administrators. Some attempt to resist it, but most go along with it. A few make it a kind of tacit policy: don't expect to get promoted unless you have a job offer from somewhere else. This is tantamount to encouraging the evaluation of one's staff by others, of placing the locus of responsibility outside the institution. Small wonder, then, that teaching and committee work, student counseling and advising, and other non-visibility-producing activities are so often seen as obstacles to research and professional involvement which do promote visibility. Small wonder, also, that so many faculty members feel that only lip service is being paid to good teaching.

Yet teaching is what occupies most of their time, and it is high on the list of values. Most teachers like to teach and feel that good teaching should be rewarded, are unhappy that it is not. When comparisons were made between what they do and what they would like to do, what they do and what gets rewarded, large discrepancies emerged. In some cases, correlations approached zero or were actually negative.

The same situation was discovered with respect to reward values. Comparing the actual value hierarchy with the availability of these rewards, there were major discrepancies. Again, some of the correlations were zero or negative.

Another line of analysis was equally intriguing. It compared the faculty members' descriptions of their job activities and preferences with the perceptions of administrators. It was apparent that many administrators simply do not know what their faculty members do and especially do not know what they would like to do. The same was true with respect to reward values: administrative perceptions were markedly uncorrelated with faculty descriptions.

There appears to be a wide gulf in the communication process between faculty members and administrators. Upward and downward communication are both poor. Small wonder, then, that personnel policies, set in most cases by the administrators, are ineffectual. These policies are designed for individuals who do not exist!

Faculty members leave for a variety of reasons. In general, they leave only when the situation becomes intolerable. It is in teaching that they find activities and rewards that are of great importance, more so than anywhere else. They value teaching, and like to do it. It was interesting to note the large numbers or former teachers who had gone to great lengths to find part-time teaching opportunities.

They also value independence and freedom which are generally more available on the campus than elsewhere. They like to choose their own times for work, their own lines of inquiry. Yet one young chemistry professor offers an example of a problem in this respect. After earning his doctorate, he took a job as a research chemist with a large industrial firm. While there, he had an excellent salary, first rate equipment, and considerable freedom. However, he always had the feeling that his research somehow ought to pay off in new products for the company. He took a position in a well known university. His salary was lower, and his equipment was poorer, but he had the freedom he sought. However, to do the kind of work he wanted, he found that he had to get research contracts and that the agencies also had their ideas of the important problems to be supported. At the time of the interview, he was seriously considering returning to industry.

This is related to another serious problem, one that is involved in a number of decisions to leave. Colleges have largely lost, and universities are in real danger of losing their place as sources of new knowledge, especially in the sciences. Many chemists and psychologists feel that, if one is to keep at the frontiers of his field, two things are necessary: (1) a security clearance which permits one access to important research findings, and (2) fairly regular periods of work at places such as Oak Ridge or Los Alamos. Few English scholars found their own libraries adequate.

Recalling what was said earlier about the commonly held idea that it is professional and disciplinary visibility and acceptance that are the highways to success, it is not surprising that many young men in particular are troubled by this and are considering leaving teaching. Research, the opportunity to learn, is also high among the reward values, and it is one for which fewer and fewer institutions are providing outlets, particularly in the sciences where the costs of equipment are so great.

This is also related to another reward value—intellectual stimulation from colleagues. Oak Ridge and the National Bureau of Standards, two of the agencies visited, were in general much livelier and more stimulating places than most of the college and university campuses. The men there had the feeling that they were out on the very edge of discovery, moving mountains while their university colleagues were forced to come behind picking up the pebbles.

The fact that many of the men in these agencies miss campus life and teaching suggests that one possibility lies in developing extensive exchange programs. This will do little to help universities retain their traditional place as the major source of new ideas, ideas generated from the free inquiry of first-rate men, but it might stem the tide out of teaching.

Sometimes the decision to leave is the result of personal or interpersonal conflicts. Some of those who left had job histories showing very high mobility among colleges. Their post-teaching job histories often showed the same pattern. It suggests a personal restlessness, a search for something of which the men themselves may not be aware. It is not unreasonable to believe that vocational counseling might be useful in many instances.

In some cases, faculty members have been on the losing side in campus vendettas, have been in effect purged by the victors. Or, they may have found their superiors impossible autocrats. The climate of fear of the McCarthy era seemed to have been responsible for some men leaving. Because they spoke out against what they believed to be invasions of their rights, their frightened administrators or boards of trustees found means to get rid of them. The files of the AAUP contain many instances of this.

The failure to engage in long-range planning also accounted for some turnover. In 1949 and 1950, when the postwar enrollments dropped off, several universities encouraged faculty members to take leaves of absence until rising enrollments would bring budgets back up. After leaving and taking positions with excellent research opportunities and much better salaries, many of these men could not bring themselves to return.

Salary is also involved but in complicated ways. To a man earning $4,000 a year, an offer of $6,000 represents a very tempting possibility. To a man earning $10,000, an offer of $15,000 may not be particularly appealing. He is far enough above the subsistence level to permit himself the luxury of considering other features of his present job and of the one being offered.

Money also enters indirectly into such considerations as teaching load, laboratory equipment, library facilities, assistants, secretarial help, research support, sabbatical leaves, etc. Institutions of higher education appear in many cases to have been penny wise and pound foolish. At one university a letter was sent to the faculty asking for their needs. The requests were, for the most part, modest.

The decision to leave teaching was, for most of the former teachers, a wrenching, difficult one in which they had, in effect, to decide to give up some values of great importance, to change their entire style of life. Most did not make this decision until their lives became virtually intolerable. Most regret in the extreme the necessity of having had to make the decision. Most of them would like to return, but few will. For many, the liking is not at sufficient strength; for others, the conditions they specify are unrealistic. Nevertheless, both groups live with a nagging feeling of frustration that is not good. They are somewhat like another group who, while still physically present on campus and in the classroom, have actually left. They have retired into shells, are of little use to themselves, less to their students.

All of these individuals became college teachers because of the kinds of people they are. They left college teaching only, in most cases, under extreme duress. Because so many enter teaching as the result of what appears to be chance, it would seem wise to undertake to establish guidance and recruitment programs that might yield more good teachers. Because so many who leave it do so in the face of poor personnel policies and practices and poorer working conditions, it would seem that this is a good time to start improving personnel policy formulation and working conditions. Much of this improvement requires the expenditure of rather large amounts of money, but quite a bit can be done with very modest amounts of money—provided that it is disbursed with a maximum amount of imagination.

Chapter Two

Background of the Study

THE ACUTE CONCERN over the status of higher education in America is of comparatively recent vintage. Two or three major problems have translated this concern into at least the beginning of action programs. First of all, there is the ubiquitous tidal wave of students. The sharply increased birth rate during and following the Second World War created a population of likely college students much larger than higher education is presently prepared to cope with. The pamphlet prepared by Thompson at Ohio State University[1] states the case and describes the problem very well.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that the students now in college and graduate school, on whom we must draw for our supply of teachers, are members of a low birth rate generation, the depression babies. On their heels are the hordes of students who are causing the concern.

Worse, there is now very keen competition for the highly trained products of our graduate schools. Higher education no longer has the field to itself. Business and industry as well as government at all levels now see the importance of hiring the same kinds of people who are needed as college teachers. So far, at least, these other employers have been willing and able to offer considerably better salaries and often better fringe benefits and working conditions.

The second problem that has created concern about higher education has to do with the international situation. Quite literally, our very survival seems to depend on how effectively and imaginatively we employ the intellectual resources at our disposal. Our principal adversaries, the Russians, seem to have stolen several marches on us in this respect. The dramatic appearance of Sputnik I served to bring home to us the fallacy of our great technical and scientific superiority.

Suddenly, we have become aware that our material resources are not enough to save us. We must identify and use our intellectual resources to their fullest. Yet, the number of individuals who have the kinds of intellectual capacity to become scientists and scholars is limited. Wolfle[2] has provided excellent data on this point. He points out clearly the scarcity of high level talent. If one goes out on the scale of intelligence to the point considered to be a minimum for attaining the doctorate, one finds that only about one or two individuals in a hundred have such ability. This means that there are fewer than two million of these people in the country. They have to be divided among a large number of occupations. Since comparatively few women follow professional careers, the group is virtually halved. Largely out of this pool of roughly a million individuals must come the scientists and scholars as well as the physicians, lawyers, technicians, and industrial and government leaders on whom our security rests.

If talented young people cannot obtain the highest possible quality of higher education, this pool of manpower is automatically prevented from employing their talents to the solution of America's and the world's many problems. Higher education must recruit adequate numbers of able young men and women, for it is the key, the cornerstone.

A third source of concern is closely related to the first two but is of somewhat more limited scope. Population and economic changes have made several regions realize that they must undertake to develop their resources for themselves. The southern region in particular has been undergoing some dramatic changes. Increased industrialization, for instance, has created a demand for many more well trained individuals than are available. The South has for many years had to import a large proportion of the scientists, technicians, scholars, and business leaders that it needs.

Ten years ago, in 1949, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was established to coordinate a region-wide effort to improve the educational facilities existing and to create new ones where needed. Sixteen states are now members of the compact. Agreements have been effected so that specialized training programs in one state may be made available to students from others. Studies of personnel needs have been conducted along with surveys of available training facilities. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Southern Regional Education Board seems to have done a good job. Two other regions have followed suit and established regional higher education programs: the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) and the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE).

In July of 1953, the SREB called together psychologists representing the states in the region to examine the personnel problems in psychology. This group became the Council on Psychological Resources in the South. Several committees were established, and plans were started to study the training and utilization of psychologists as well as regional needs. One of these committees was the Committee on Psychological Personnel.

The Council's first major effort came in supporting a SREB study of mental health personnel. This study was directed by Dr. Nicholas Hobbs[3] and was concerned with four mental health disciplines: psychiatry, psychology (clinical), psychiatric nursing, and psychiatric social work. As far as psychology was concerned, this study amply documented an acute shortage of psychologists in the region.

With this information in hand, the Committee on Psychological Personnel began discussions of research on psychology in all of its aspects. Fairly soon, the committee saw that teaching personnel were the key to other problems. Without adequate numbers of qualified teachers of psychology, there seemed to be no alternative but for the region to continue to be an importer, to have to rely on other regions to train its teachers as well as its practitioners of psychology.

---

[1] Thompson, Ronald. *The Impending Tidal Wave of Students.*

[2] Wolfle, Dael L. *America's Resources of Specialized Talent.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1954.

[3] Hobbs, Nicholas. *Mental Health Training and Research in the Southern States.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board, 1954.

At about this time, the SREB received a very substantial grant from the Carnegie Corporation to support research on a variety of problems of higher education in the region. Staff members of the SREB encouraged the committee to prepare a proposal for research which might be supported by these funds. The committee did so and submitted the proposal to SREB in the early spring of 1957.

The original proposal called for studying college teaching of psychology. It envisioned collecting data from presently employed teachers of psychology as well as from graduate students, from psychologists employed in non-teaching positions, and from those who had formerly been teachers of psychology but who had left for other positions.

The advisory committee on research approved the proposal. It was then suggested to the committee that perhaps the study might be expanded to include other disciplines. This required some revision in the plans for the study, but the changes seemed feasible, and the committee agreed to include two other disciplines, English and chemistry. The reasons for the selection of these two will be given in the next chapter.

The writer was then asked whether he would consider assuming responsibility for directing the study. He agreed, and negotiations were undertaken with the University of Maryland to see whether it would agree to participate in and partially support the research. The agreement reached was that SREB would provide funds for all costs except overhead and office space. The university agreed to assume fiscal responsibility for disbursing the funds and to provide office space and other needed services.

In July, 1957, the project was begun. Work began immediately on drawing the samples and developing the data collection instruments. Details of these activities are included in the next chapter.

In planning the study, it was discovered that little research had been devoted to faculty personnel. The literature contains many discursive pieces, but almost none rest on research.

Within the past two or three years, however, several investigators have begun to work in this area. Caplow and McGee[4] have completed their study of the recruitment process. This study highlights both the intricacy and the chaos that characterize this important process. This research was based on visits to ten of the nation's most outstanding universities; for this reason, the generality of their results is open to serious question. Nevertheless, they have provided much interesting information about the career decisions of college teachers.

A second study has been done by Eckert and Stecklein[5] of the University of Minnesota. Employing both questionnaires and interviews, they studied a large sample of presently employed teachers in the colleges and universities of the state of Minnesota. The major deficiency of this study is the lack of a comparison group made up either of teachers who had moved to other teaching posts or who had left teaching entirely. Not having such a comparison group makes some interpretations of their extensive data difficult. Nevertheless, they have added a great deal to what is known about college teachers. George A. Gropper of the American Institute for Research is just completing a study of the variables involved in student decisions to become teachers. This study employs the critical incidents technique, a method which is very powerful in its ability to cover the complete range of a set of variables.

The Association for Higher Education is currently supporting a study of the conditions of work for faculty members and administrators. Miss Louise Wood[6] is directing the project. She is employing a well designed questionnaire and has obtained returns from an impressively large proportion of her sample. The data are now being analyzed and a report should be available in the relatively near future.

The work of Lazarsfeld and Thielens[7] is concerned with a comparatively narrow band of problems but also adds to what is known about college teachers. They were most concerned with the morale effects of the loyalty investigations on college campuses.

Dean A. D. Albright[8] of the University of Kentucky is surveying programs for the recruitment and training of college teachers. This study, like the present one, is being done with the support of the Southern Regional Education Board.

Two earlier books seem worth special mention. One by Wilson[9] was a truly pioneering effort to look at college teachers through the eyes of a sociologist. The other, by Woodburne[10] was a study of personnel policies and practices done by means of interviews in 48 colleges and universities. Many of the ideas contained in these books are still widely current and valid.

Those interested in the literature on college teachers and college teaching will be interested in consulting the very extensive and complete annotated bibliography prepared by Eels.[11] This was also done with support from the Southern Regional Education Board and provides the investigator with valuable leads to articles and books relevant to faculty personnel.

It is encouraging to note this surge of research activity on the many problems having to do with faculty personnel. In the last analysis, of course, each institution will have to examine its own situation, but studies such as those mentioned above as well as this one will serve to identify the most promising variables and to provide a pool of experience in methods of studying them. All of the studies done to date have drawn on the traditional methods of personnel psychology, sociology, and education. It is quite likely that new methods, tailored to the problems, will have to be developed, but much more research is needed before anyone can be confident that all of the major, relevant variables have been identified. Colleges and universities, which have for so long furnished expert consultation to business, industry, and government, have been remiss in not devoting some of their research efforts to their own problems. Such efforts are long overdue, but it is better to start now than later.

---

[4] Caplow, Theodore and McGee, Reece J. *The Academic Marketplace.* New York: Basic Books, 1958.

[5] Eckert, Ruth E. and Stecklein, John E. *An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota (mimeographed), 1958.

[6] Wood, Louise A. Conditions of Work for College Faculty and Administrators (Project in progress).

[7] Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Thielens, Wagner, Jr. *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.

[8] Albright, A. D., and Barrows, John, *Preparing College Teachers.* Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1960.

[9] Wilson, Logan E. *The Academic Man.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1932.

[10] Woodburne, Lloyd S. *Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.

[11] Eels, Walter C. *College Teachers and College Teaching: an annotated bibliography.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1957. Supplement published in June 1959.

Chapter Three

Methods

IT IS OFTEN SAID that one of the most important things that can come out of any research project is the knowledge of how to do it better the next time. This is certainly the case with the present study. Problems were encountered for which there was little or no precedent; decisions were made without benefit of the guidelines that come from a well-developed body of prior research.

In the committee discussions that preceded the development of the research proposal, there was general agreement on several main points although the details of conducting the study were left to the staff. We agreed first of all on the desirability of employing the interview as one data gathering technique. The interview as a research tool has several advantages and disadvantages, the former outweighing the latter for the present study. The two major disadvantages of the interview are: (1) it is time consuming, requiring the presence of a highly skilled interviewer; (2) the reliability of the interview is typically lower than for standardized tests and carefully constructed questionnaires. The interviewer has biases, and these perceptions and preconceptions inevitably color the data obtained to some extent.

At the same time, it is a uniquely powerful tool in that it *does* permit and foster the interaction between people, an interaction which produces data that more objective techniques do not. For example, one of the areas in which we were interested had to do with the subjects' occupational role perceptions or self concepts. That is, we were interested in whether they thought of themselves primarily as members of a discipline, as teachers, or as faculty members at a given institution. Try as we might, we could not develop satisfactory questionnaire items for this variable. At the same time, we were reasonably sure that, in an interview setting, we could recognize it and identify these role perceptions. As things turned out, we were right.

The committee also felt that there should be at least two groups of subjects so that comparisons might make interpretations of results more meaningful. For this reason, we studied both presently employed teachers and former teachers—individuals who had left teaching for other positions. We considered including individuals who had moved from one institution to another, but the limits of the study did not permit this.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Two methods of data collection were employed, the questionnaire and the interview. The questionnaire as an instrument has been so widely misused that many now react reflexly against it. This is unfortunate since a well-designed and carefully prepared questionnaire can be very useful. Too often, questionnaires are developed by the simple process of asking all of the questions that come readily to mind. Very few are pretested to see whether they are clear in what is asked for.

The questionnaires employed in this study are included in Appendix C. In developing them, considerable reliance was placed on a review of the theoretical and empirical literature related to occupational choice. Greatest reliance was placed on the theoretical position developed by Blau *et al.*[1] Using this and drawing on other materials, a series of hypotheses were specified, hypotheses having to do with why people become college teachers and why some of them later abandon teaching for other positions.

After the hypotheses had been specified, the staff then outlined the kinds of data that would be needed to test them. In some cases, we had to conclude that it was impossible to obtain the needed data; in others, we had to settle for less than fully satisfactory information.

Having specified the kinds of information needed, we then began to develop the questionnaire items. Items were written to elicit specific kinds of information either factual or opinion. The items were then assembled into Form F, the form used for present teachers. Other forms (L for former teachers, A for administrators, and G for graduate students) were modifications of Form F.

With the assistance of the members of the Committee on Psychological Personnel, a tryout of the preliminary version of the questionnaire was arranged. Individuals in this tryout sample were asked to complete the questionnaire, to time themselves on the task, and to make comments and suggestions about items included. On the basis of the tryout, the questionnaire was revised extensively. It was shortened considerably although it remained fairly long even so. Many of the items were revised to make them clearer or to permit reply by check-marks rather than requiring a written answer. The revised form was then tried again with a different sample. Apparently, this care in development was worthwhile, because very few of the respondents indicated that they had any difficulty in understanding the items. Some did not like the questions, but that is another matter.

It was decided that the interview would be fairly well structured. For most purposes, particularly where time is an issue, some structuring is desirable.[2] A copy of the interview outline is included in Appendix B. Preliminary tryouts of the interview indicated that approximately an hour and a half was sufficient time for most subjects. Certain items were revised and some added.

In general, the interview was designed to cover much of the same ground as the questionnaire. This served as a reliability check on questionnaire responses. At the same time, certain areas which could not be adequately dealt with in the questionnaires were emphasized. For instance, perceptions of occupational role (see above) were elicited in the interview as were reactions of spouses to teaching.

---

[1] Blau, Peter M., Gustad, John W., Jessor, Richard, Parnes, Herbert S., and Wilcock, Richard C. "Occupational Choice: a conceptual framework." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1956, 9, 531-543.

[2] Bingham, Walter V., Moore, Bruce V., and Gustad, John W. *How to Interview*. Fourth revised edition. New York: Harper and Bros., 1959.

While the interview was a fairly well structured one, it was planned to encourage subjects to talk freely. In a number of interviews, the subjects' free discussion made asking questions unnecessary; all of the topics and areas were adequately covered. In many cases, the interviewer followed the subjects' leads and dealt with topics in the order that seemed most natural and comfortable. All interviewers made sure that they covered all of the topics in the outline.

Interviews were scheduled at the rate of four per day. This was done to permit time for completing the interview report. It was also about the limit of endurance for the interviewer.

THE SAMPLE AND RETURNS

Concurrent with the development of the data collection instruments, the sampling problems were attacked. These turned out to be exceedingly difficult. There was no source which could be relied upon to provide accurate and current information needed to specify the sample properly.

Three disciplines were selected for study: chemistry, English, and psychology. There were two principal reasons for selecting these. First of all, they represent fairly well the three major areas of the arts and science curriculum: the natural sciences, the bio-social sciences, and the humanities. Secondly, they vary widely in terms of the availability of non-teaching positions. In English, it is exceedingly difficult to find a non-teaching position which permits the individual to utilize his training directly. When individuals leave teaching posts in English, they go to a wide variety of positions including library work, publishing, sales, public relations, etc. Only a few find positions in such places as the Folger or Huntington Libraries or The Library of Congress. In chemistry, on the other hand, the vast majority of chemists are employed in non-teaching posts. Industry and government at all levels employ chemists in large numbers. Psychology stands between these extremes. Just over half of all psychologists are employed in non-teaching posts. Of the three disciplines studied, the psychologists have the most nearly equal opportunities to work as college teachers or in non-teaching posts.

In order to draw our sample, we had to know who was presently in college teaching and who had been in teaching but had left. The latter group presented the most problems. The 1957 edition of the *Directory* of the American Psychological Association was available. This contains biographical summaries on most members. However, since about a third of all psychologists change jobs each year, even this was not entirely up-to-date. For those in chemistry and English, the problems were much more difficult. There are no general biographical listings for these disciplines. The American Chemical Society's *Directory* contains only current addresses with no indication of previous jobs. The Modern Language Association, to which the largest number of those in English belong, is in the same situation. Worse, however, a substantial number of those in English do not belong to the association.

Other, less satisfactory sources were explored. Letters were sent to all department chairmen in the region asking them to list their present staffs and, insofar as possible, the names of individuals who had left. These returns gave us fairly good information. The National Academy of Sciences and the National Science Foundation were asked for help. The former maintains a card file on a large number of scientists. This file, however, was not sufficiently current to be usable in the study. The National Science Foundation's rosters did not contain the kind of information needed.

American Men of Science was utilized to obtain names of chemists who met the criteria for inclusion in the study. This, however, produced an upward bias since one must have attained some distinction to be listed in *American Men of Science*. Other publications, such as *Who's Who in American Education, Leaders in American Education,* and the *Directory of American Scholars* were also used. They also produced some upward bias but were the best sources available. Finally, because a large number of former teachers of English had entered the book publishing field, letters were sent to several of the major companies inquiring about individuals who might be included in the study. These inquiries yielded a number of names.

Questionnaires were sent to each of the former teachers. In the case of present teachers, packets of questionnaires, one packet for each of the three departments, were sent to the presidents of the colleges and universities included. They distributed the packets to the departments. Completed questionnaires were returned directly to the project office. Questionnaires for graduate students were also included where appropriate. The list of institutions taking part is included in Appendix A. Data on returns are included in tables following.

At the same time, plans were made for the interviewing visits. To reduce travel costs and time, cluster sampling was employed. Several possible clusters were considered. For the present teachers, three clusters were found to contain the best sample: central Texas, central Tennessee, and the Baltimore-Washington area. All of the institutions visited were included in these three.

For the former teachers, the problem was more difficult than for present teachers. Clusters were harder to find. Finally, however, reasonable numbers were located in a few clusters. The former teachers of chemistry were interviewed in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in Washington, D. C., and in Wilmington, Delaware. Former teachers of English and psychology were interviewed in Washington, D. C. and New York City.

Table 1 summarizes the returns in terms of numbers and percentages. There is undoubtedly some error in these data since some of the questionnaires did not reach the individuals to whom sent because of incorrect addresses. These returns are the result of several follow-up efforts. Both post cards and letters with additional questionnaires were used in these. Data collection was terminated as of April 1, 1958, in order that the analysis might begin.

Table 3 summarizes the returns on the interviews. Comparatively few individuals who were asked refused to be interviewed. A number, however, were unavailable for a variety of other reasons. In some cases, individuals agreed

TABLE 1

Summary of Faculty Members' Questionnaire Returns

Field	*Present Teachers*	*Former Teachers*	*Total*
Chemistry			
Sent	745	229	974
Returned	480	123	603
% Returned	64	54	62
% Usable	96	77	92
English			
Sent	874	135	1009
Returned	546	69	615
% Returned	62	51	61
% Usable	100*	100*	100*
Psychology			
Sent	516	166	682
Returned	316	131	447
% Returned	61	79	65
% Usable	88	74	84
Total: Sent, 2665;** Returned, 1665			

* Because of small N, all were used, even though with incomplete data on some items.
** Does not include graduate students.

TABLE 2

Number of Administrators' Questionnaires Returned

Questionnaires	*College*	*University*	*Total*
Sent	77	33	110
Returned	69	27	96
% Returned	90	82	87

TABLE 3

Number of Interviews Conducted[1]

Field	*College*		*University*		*Total*
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	
Chemistry	4	9	18	20	51
English	4	4	18	7	33
Psychology	5	4	18	10	37
Total	13	17	54	37	121

1. Present and former college and university teachers, white, male only.

to be interviewed who had refused to complete the questionnaire.

Tests were made of the possible bias introduced by non-respondents. In psychology, it was possible, because of the completeness of the *Directory*, to test on four variables: age, sex, type of institution, and degree status. Comparisons between respondents and non-respondents were made; in no case was there a significant difference. For the other two disciplines, it was possible to compare only on sex and type of institution. These differences were also insignificant. Insofar as it was possible, then, we determined that the respondents were not different from the non-respondents. This is not to say that no biases exist. As was mentioned above, there was an upward bias (in the direction of age, experience, and visibility) in the case of the former teachers of chemistry and English. The point here is that the same kinds of individuals appear to have returned the questionnaires as did not.

This report is based on the analysis of data from present and former white, male college and university teachers. Women, Negroes, graduate students, and present and former teachers in teachers' colleges and technical institutions will be dealt with in subsequent reports. For purposes of data analysis, the questionnaires were divided into two groups, an analysis group and a cross validation group.[3] Table 4 summarizes the sample used in the analysis. The analysis and cross validation samples were selected with great care so that they would contain the same kinds of individuals.

TABLE 4

Sample of Questionnaires Used in Data Analysis

Field	*Present Teachers*		*Former Teachers*	
	N	*% Usable***	*N*	*% Usable*
Chemistry				
1*	150	71	50	53
2	50	24	50	53
English				
1	150	48	46	57
2	50	16	50	57
Psychology				
1	150	[illegible]3	50	100
2	50	[illegible]8	50	100

* 1. Sample used in study of life histories, job activities, rewards, and personnel practices.
2. Sample used in cluster analysis of personality traits.
** Indicates per cent of questionnaires returned in usable form actually included in the analysis.

The cross validation feature was introduced in part because of the extended analyses being done in connection with their doctoral theses by Mr. Berenson and Mr. Welsh. The cross validations are not included in this report but will be available in the dissertations. For purposes of this report, a total of 588 cases were studied.

---

[3] This was done in part to permit analyses required in the doctoral theses of Mr. Berenson and Mr. Welsh. Their selecting problems in this area permitted considerable extension of the study. Parts of their results ar eincluded in this report. Copies of their completed theses will be deposited with the SREB.

Chapter Four

Analysis of Life Histories

THIS RESEARCH has been characterized[1] as a study of the motivation for college teaching. In a sense, it is. Motivation, however, is not a variable that can be observed or measured directly; it must always be inferred from an analysis of behavior. Motivation is an intervening variable. What one does to assess motivation is to study a variety of behavioral items and from them infer the motivational structure.

Occupational choices, including the decision to become a college teacher, have histories. When the individual is finally faced with the decision of entering or not entering an occupation, he brings with him a whole lifetime of developed abilities, interests, attitudes, feelings, and perceptions. In the following chapter, these reward systems—the developed values—will be considered. In this chapter, attention will be focused on the life histories of these men, present and former college and university teachers, in the hope that out of such an analysis will come grounds for forming at least a tentative set of hypotheses about the reasons for their decisions. Family background, marital status, religious, social, educational, and occupational histories will be considered in that order.

In Table 5 are summarized certain data regarding these men's present status. The only item that differentiated significantly between present and former teachers is age and that only for English. Former teachers are significantly older than present teachers. As will be seen later, those in English tend to identify more strongly with teaching. This, coupled with the fact of relatively fewer non-teaching jobs being available to people in English, may account for this difference. In other words, the English teacher hangs on longer before he makes the decision to leave teaching.

Looking at the ages at marriage, it is apparent that most of the men married before completing their graduate training. Whereas the average age of marriage is about 26 or 27, the average age at completion of graduate work is slightly over 30. It is likely that most of the wives acquired the P.H.T. (Put Him Through) when their husbands received the Ph.D.

Most of the men have two or three children. It is interesting to note how closely the age at completion of graduate work coincides with these men's ages when their first children were born. The pattern of working wife and some delay in starting families is certainly common among college teachers.

Table 6 describes the geographical origins of these men. Certain of these yielded statistically significant differences between present and former teachers. In terms of their own birthplaces, the largest group of men came from the southeastern region. The northeast and midwest produced the next largest numbers. It is apparent that the region does not draw its teachers from the West, particularly the coast and the northwest. Those from the northeast tend to be disproportionately represented among the group having left teaching.

The same situations pertain as far as parents' birthplaces are concerned. Most of the parents are from southern homes. Among the former teachers of English (and for the sample as a whole), those whose fathers were born in the northeast and, to a lesser extent, in the midwest were among those most likely to have left. The same is true with respect to mothers' birthplaces. In general, those from the northeast, particularly those in English, are more likely to leave teaching than are those who were born or whose parents were born in the southeast.

Further data on family backgrounds are included in Table 7. Although no differences between present and former teachers emerged, the fathers, especially if one considers the national norms for their school ages, are relatively well educated. This, it will be seen later, goes along with their above average occupational and social levels.

In the case of the mothers, however, one significant difference appeared. This was in English. Here the cell which is out of line is the one for former teachers whose mothers were educated beyond the high school. In general, mothers of present teachers were better educated than were those of former teachers.

Fathers' occupational levels are coded in terms of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. A code of "O" is used for professional and managerial occupations. It may be seen that a disproportionately large number of fathers fall into this group. A code of "1" is used for clerical and sales occupations, a code of "2" for service occupations, and a code of "3" for agriculture, fishing, and forestry. Codes 4 through 9 are used for skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled occupations respectively. None of the fathers was reported in the service occupations. The largest numbers were in the top three code levels, indicating, in general, fairly high socio-economic status.

Family positions, which are alleged in many studies and articles to have much to do with subsequent adjustment, did not appear to be related to the criterion of remaining in or leaving college teaching. More of these men are oldest or middle children than youngest, but the differences are not particularly striking.

Table 8 presents further data about home and family backgrounds. The item dealing with the education of siblings did differentiate between the criterion groups, at least in chemistry and for the group as a whole. The relationship is one which suggests that those whose siblings are best educated are heavily represented among the group of former teachers. It is possible that this is due to status considerations. Where the individual is the only (or one of very few) well educated individuals in a family, being a

---

[1] Ness, Frederick W. *The Role of the College in the Recruitment of Teachers,* Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges, 1958.

TABLE 5
Age and Family Status of Present and Former Teachers

Age and Family Status	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Age (mean)	43.4	43.6	42.9	46.6*	42.9	43.3	43.1	44.5
Marital Status								
Married or Widowed (percent)	90.7	90.0	81.4	87.0	94.7	90.0	88.9	89.0
Single, divorced or separated (percent)	9.3	10.0	18.6	13.0	5.3	10.0	11.1	11.0
Age at marriage (mean)	26.5	25.9	26.8	27.7	26.3	26.0	26.5	26.5
Number children (mean)	2.9	3.2	2.3	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.9
Age when oldest child born (mean)	30.0	29.0	30.9	31.7	30.3	30.0	30.4	30.2

* Test of difference between present and former teachers statistically significant at the P = .05 level. An asterisk in all tables following will have the same meaning.

TABLE 6
Birthplaces of Present and Former Teachers and of Their Parents
(In percentages)

Birthplace	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Teacher's Place of Birth								
Northeast	18.0	26.0	23.3	34.7*	23.3	32.0	21.3	31.1*
Southeast	36.0	22.0	50.0	19.5	22.7	26.0	35.9	22.8
Southwest	8.7	16.0	10.7	19.5	10.7	14.0	9.9	16.6
Midwest	21.3	16.0	11.3	15.2	26.0	22.0	19.4	17.9
Other	16.0	20.0	4.7	10.9	17.3	6.0	12.6	12.4
Father's Place of Birth								
Northeast	16.7	12.0	19.3	26.0*	15.3	16.0	16.9	17.9*
Southeast	41.4	34.0	54.7	26.0	28.0	24.0	36.5	23.5
Southwest					6.0	16.0	6.4	10.4
Midwest	18.7	18.0	14.7	26.0	22.7	18.0	18.5	20.7
Foreign	14.7	24.0	8.7	17.4	20.7	20.0	14.5	20.7
Other	8.7	12.0	2.7	4.3	7.3	6.0	6.2	7.6
Mother's Place of Birth								
Northeast	18.7	20.0	18.0	23.9*	16.0	22.0	17.4	22.1*
Southeast	44.7	34.0	59.4	30.4	34.7	36.0	38.5	24.2
Southwest							7.3	9.7
Midwest	17.3	20.0	11.3	23.9	22.7	24.0	16.9	22.8
Foreign	13.3	16.0	6.7	10.9	17.3	14.0	12.3	13.8
Other	6.0	10.0	4.7	10.9	9.3	4.0	6.6	8.3

TABLE 7
Family Backgrounds of Present and Former Teachers
(In percentages)

Parental Education, Occupation and Teacher's Position in Family	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Father's Education								
College	27.4	32.0	36.0	36.9	28.0	20.0	30.1	29.7
High School	30.7	16.0	26.7	39.1	25.4	30.0	27.3	28.3
Less	36.7	38.0	30.7	23.9	46.0	48.0	37.4	37.3
No reply	5.4	14.0	6.7	0.0	.7	2.0	4.2	5.5
Mother's Education								
Beyond High school	29.3	36.0	35.4	15.2*	30.7	24.0	31.5	25.5
High School Graduate	30.7	22.0	32.7	56.4	25.4	30.0	29.3	35.9
Less	36.0	28.0	26.0	26.0	42.7	44.0	34.5	33.1
No reply	4.0	14.0	6.0	2.2	1.3	2.0	3.7	6.2
Father's Occupation								
Professional & Managerial (0)	44.0	52.0	71.4	80.3	57.4	52.0	53.2	60.0
Sales (1)	14.7	12.0			13.3	12.0	13.0	9.7
Service (2)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Agriculture (3)	16.7	14.0	26.0	15.2	9.3	14.0	12.1	13.1
Labor (4-9)	16.7	16.0			14.0	16.0	15.2	12.3
No reply	8.0	6.0	2.7	4.3	6.0	6.0	5.5	5.5
Number of Siblings (mean)	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.27	2.17	2.0	2.1
Position in Family								
Youngest	24.7	18.0	20.7	23.9	18.7	14.0	21.1	18.6
Middle	27.4	44.0	20.7	23.9	22.7	36.0	23.3	35.2
Oldest	26.7	22.0	37.4	30.4	28.7	38.0	30.6	30.4
No reply	21.3	16.0	21.3	21.7	30.0	12.0	24.0	16.6

TABLE 8

Family Backgrounds of Present and Former Teachers

Family Education and History	Chemistry		English		Psychology		Total	
	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former
Education of Siblings* (number)								
MA-Ph.D.	34	23	38	20	57	26	129	69
B.A.	116	41	111	26	103	27	330	94
Junior College	56	16	43	19	56	18	155	53
High School	76	33	65	21	61	24	202	78
Non High School	42	6	49	8	62	17	153	31
Family Income (percent)								
Above Average	16.0	24.0	18.7	28.2	24.7	30.0	19.6	27.6
Average	72.0	52.0	66.0	60.8	56.0	52.0	64.0	55.2
Below Average	12.0	24.0	14.7	10.9	19.3	18.0	15.2	17.9
No reply	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Migration (Number of Moves):								
Before College (mean)	1.3	1.6	1.9	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.7
After College (mean)	2.2	2.0	3.0	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.6	3.4
Size of Home Community (percent)								
Farm	13.3	12.0	39.4	34.7	12.0	16.0	8.4	9.7
Village-town	40.0	42.0			34.0	22.0	37.4	33.1
Small City	24.7	22.0	26.7	19.5	26.7	32.0	25.7	24.8
Large City	22.0	24.0	25.3	34.7	24.0	30.0	23.5	29.7

*The sum of these numbers is greater than the total N because respondents checked *all* levels of education up to the highest.

college teacher carries considerable prestige. Where there are several well-educated individuals, other intellectual jobs carry prestige, perhaps making the decision to enter a position in government or business easier.

Family income was a significant differentiator only for chemists. Here, the relationship appeared to be curvilinear: that is, those from high or low income homes were more likely to have left teaching. Otherwise, the group as a whole comes from mostly average or above slightly average income homes.

The items dealing with changes in the home community were included to obtain data bearing on the hypothesis of a pattern of mobility that might be associated with the men's own behavior. Changes before college did not bear out the hypothesis. Only the present teachers of psychology came from homes where there appeared to be a considerable amount of mobility.

On the other hand, post-college mobility *was* associated with the criterion. This was true for all three disciplines. It seems to be associated with a high mobility pattern in jobs that will be seen to characterize the former teachers generally. From other questionnaire data and from the interviews, one may easily get a feeling of restlessness among the former teachers.

Finally, size of the home community was not associated with the criterion. The largest group of these men were from villages or small towns. Considering the population characteristics of the southern region, from which most of these men came, this is understandable. Whether this would be true in studies made in other regions, particularly in the northeast, cannot be determined here. It is quite likely that other patterns would emerge.

Tables 9 and 10 describe some other variables related to home environments. They are based on interview responses of the present and former teachers. Differences among the disciplines as well as between college and university and present and former teachers are evident. We will concentrate attention on the differences between the present and former teachers.

The first of these variables has to do with the intellectual climate of the home. The means are based on ratings made on a five point scale where a 5 represents an unusually rich environment and a 1 an extremely impoverished (even anti-intellectual) one. The only large differences between present and former teachers emerged in the case of English. Here, the present college teachers came from somewhat richer intellectual environments whereas the reverse was true for the university teachers. The backgrounds of the university teachers were, in general, poorer on this variable than were those of the college teachers. This relates to a difference in values and aspirations (to be discussed in detail in the next chapter) which appeared as a

TABLE 9

Home Influences and Attitudes Toward School

(From interviews)

	Chemistry				English				Psychology			
	College		University		College		University		College		University	
	Pres. (N-4)	For. (N-9)	Pres. (N-18)	For. (N-20)	Pres. (N-4)	For. (N-4)	Pres. (N-18)	For. (N-7)	Pres. (N-5)	For. (N-4)	Pres. (N-18)	For. (N-10)
Intellectual climate of home (mean)	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.8	4.0	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.3
Existence of a teaching tradition (percent yes)	25.0	44.0	22.0	50.0	25.0	50.0	40.0	14.0	20.0	25.0	44.0	20.0
Family attitude toward education (mean)	3.2	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.3	3.8	4.2	3.4	4.4	3.8	4.1	4.3
Own attitude toward school (mean)	4.5	3.8	4.0	4.0	2.8	4.3	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.0
Socio-economic status of family (mean)	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.3	2.9	2.2	2.8	2.8	3.0

lower level of striving for intellectual eminence among college teachers generally. That is, on the average, they seemed less concerned than the university teachers with research and publication as intellectual activities. Otherwise, the groups appeared to come from moderately well endowed intellectual climates except for the present and former teachers of chemistry whose backgrounds were poorer in this respect.

The next variable, the existence of a teaching tradition, operated across the stay-leave criterion in interesting ways. Considering the group as a whole, they seem to be unrepresentative of the population in that a comparatively (disproportionately) large proportion of them came from homes with a teaching tradition of some kind. In the case of the chemists, more of the former teachers than the present came from such homes. This may relate to the intellectual striving variable mentioned above, or it may, on the other hand, represent a revolt on the part of the former teachers from a set of family pressures dictated by this tradition. In English, there was an interesting reversal. For the college teachers, present and former, the differences were like those in chemistry: the former teachers more often came from homes with a teaching tradition. The situation was reversed, however, for the present and former university teachers where the present teachers more often came from such homes. These differences, it may be seen, are quite large. Finally, in psychology, there was little or no difference between present and former college teachers, but the present university teachers were much more likely to have come from homes with a teaching tradition than were the former teachers.

It is quite likely that two sets of variables are involved in these differences. One has to do with the decision to remain in or leave teaching. The other may well be related to the choice of the field itself, a separate problem although obviously related. No single, simple interpretation seems appropriate to account for all of these differences.

Family attitude toward education was rated on a five point scale where a 5 represents a very positive and a 1 a very negative attitude toward education. Considered altogether, these men came from homes where education was held in high regard. Differences between college and university teachers and between disciplines were not marked. Only in English did the differences between present and former teachers appear to be very important. Here, family attitudes toward education were substantially more favorable for the present than for the former teachers. Because English, of all the three fields studied, is most centrally involved in the cultural aspects of education, this difference is understandable.

Next, the men's own reactions to school were studied. These were also rated on a five point scale with a 5 representing a very positive attitude toward education. With only one exception (present college teachers of English), all of these men described their attitudes toward education as well above average in the positive direction. They liked school and all that it represented. Some qualified this in the interviews by saying that they found school dull because of the necessity to keep pace with slower pupils but found learning, particularly independent reading and study, to be fascinating. Even those who found grammar and secondary school dull most often said that college and particularly graduate school were most stimulating experiences. Only in the case of college teachers of chemistry and the college teachers of English did this item appear to operate across the stay-leave criterion. For the chemists, the present teachers reported more favorable attitudes toward school than did the former teachers. In English, the reverse was true; present teachers' reactions were poorer than former teachers.'

Finally, socio-economic status was considered. This variable was also rated on a five point scale with a 5 representing very high (perceived or remembered) status. Most of the averages distributed around and close to the average point. Differences across the stay-leave criterion were for the most part quite small.

It was also believed that wives might have something important to do with the decision to remain in or leave teaching. Several characteristics of the wives are included in Table 10. As a group, the wives of these men are quite well educated. This is to be expected. Well over half hold bachelor's or higher degrees. Considering the educational levels of present and former teachers, there were no statistically significant differences. This was true

TABLE 10
Education and Birthplace of Present and Former Teachers' Wives
(In percentages)

Education and Birthplace of Wives	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Education								
Ph.D.-MA	26.0	26.0	21.3	28.2	32.0	24.0	26.2	26.2
BA	37.4	26.0	35.4	32.6	37.4	30.0	36.3	36.6
Junior College	16.7	14.0	15.3	17.4	18.7	22.0	16.7	17.9
High School	8.7	10.0	8.0	10.9	5.4	12.0	7.3	11.0
No reply	11.4	4.0	20.0	10.9	6.7	12.0	12.5	9.0
Major Field								
Same	18.0	12.0	28.7	21.7	19.3	22.0	21.8	18.6
Related	10.7	12.0	15.3	10.9	20.7	22.0	15.4	15.2
Different	48.0	56.0	27.3	36.9	44.0	26.0	39.4	40.0
None	14.0	18.0	11.3	19.5	11.3	20.0	12.1	19.3
No reply	9.3	2.0	17.3	10.9	4.7	10.0	10.3	7.6
Birthplace								
Northeast	14.7	20.0	17.3	26.0	22.0	26.0*	17.8	24.2
Southeast	32.7	26.0	38.7	23.9	25.4	22.0	31.9	24.2
Southwest	14.0	10.0	9.3	10.9	8.0	22.0	10.3	14.5
Midwest	18.7	26.0	12.0	17.4	24.0	12.0	18.0	18.6
No reply	20.0	18.0	22.7	21.7	20.7	18.0	20.9	19.3

TABLE 11
Religious Backgrounds and Preferences of Present and Former Teachers
(In percentages)

Parental and Teachers Religious Preferences	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Own Church								
Protestant	86.7	78.0	76.7	67.3	66.7	52.0*	75.9	66.2*
None	7.3	16.0	14.7	28.2	24.0	24.0	15.2	22.8
Other	6.0	6.0	8.7	4.3	9.4	24.0	7.9	11.7
Parental Religious Affiliation								
Catholic	2.7	10.0*	8.0	10.9	7.3	4.0*	5.9	8.3*
Protestant	84.7	80.0	85.4	78.1	77.4	68.0	81.6	75.9
Jewish	2.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	5.3	22.0	2.9	7.6
Other	5.3	8.0	3.3	8.7	5.3	2.0	4.6	6.2
No reply	4.7	2.0	2.7	2.2	4.7	4.0	4.0	2.8
Relation to Parents' Affiliation								
Same	87.4	78.0	82.7	69.4	72.7	72.0	80.1	73.8
Same to None	4.0	12.0	11.3	21.7	18.0	22.0	11.0	18.6
Other	8.7	10.0	6.0	8.7	9.3	6.0	7.9	8.3

for the group as a whole. In certain individual cases, as reported in the interviews, there were wives whose relatively poor educational backgrounds made them feel uncomfortable (even, occasionally, snubbed by other faculty wives) in the academic world, and these feelings contributed to the decision to leave college teaching.

Considering wives' major fields of study, it is interesting to note that, over-all, they tended to major in a field *different* from the one followed by their husbands. However, this variable also failed to yield any differences across the stay-leave criterion.

The birthplace of the wife differentiated between the present and former teachers only in English. Here, it appeared that, where the wife was born in the northeastern region, the husband was more likely to leave teaching. Taken as a group, these women were, like their husbands, of southern birth.

Certain other variables relating to wives were also examined but are not summarized in tables. These had to do with wives' work activities, social activities, and hobbies. In no case did any of these differentiate between staying in or leaving college teaching.

An examination of the religious backgrounds of these men turned up some interesting things. Table 11 summarizes these findings. Not surprisingly, considering the southern region and its traditions, most of the men reported that they are Protestants. In psychology and for the group as a whole, there were significant differences between present and former teachers. The difference seems to be accounted for mostly by the Jewish group. This may in turn relate to the items having to do with birthplace since the proportion of the population in the northeast that is of the Jewish faith is relatively high.

Considering parental religious affiliation, much the same pattern emerged. In addition, however, there was a difference in the case of the chemists, mostly accounted for by those of Catholic backgrounds. While there are some areas of the South with large concentrations of Catholics, this is not true of the region as a whole.

The last item having to do with religion was concerned with the relation between the men's reported affiliations and those of their parents. For the group as a whole, there was a significant difference with more of the former teachers having moved from the same affiliation to none. Whether this denial of tradition relates to the pervasive restlessness noted earlier with respect to former teachers is difficult to say. From the interviews, at least, it seemed to be so in some cases.

Turning from family to educational history, it may be seen, in Table 12, that these men were, for the most part,

TABLE 12
Educational Background of Present and Former Teachers

Educational Background	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Number of Schools (percent)								
A. Secondary								
1	80.0	86.0	71.4	76.0	76.0	78.0	75.0	80.7
2 or more	19.3	14.0	28.7	21.7	22.7	22.0	23.3	19.3
No reply	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.3	0.0	0.7	0.7
B. College								
1	84.0	44.0	71.4	73.8	68.7	60.0	73.9	59.3
2 or more	16.0	22.0	28.7	26.0	31.4	40.0	25.1	29.7
No reply	0.0	34.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.7
C. Graduate School								
1	58.0	74.0	46.7	34.7	50.0	36.0	51.0	49.0
2			42.0	43.4	38.0	50.0	37.4	38.0
3 or more	38.7	24.0	11.3	19.5	12.0	14.0	9.5	12.4
No reply	3.3	2.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.4
Average age at graduation								
A. Secondary School	17.2	16.8	17.0	16.9	17.2	17.1	17.1	16.9
B. College	21.9	21.5	22.2	21.7	23.0	23.5	22.4	22.2
C. Graduate School	28.3	27.2	31.2	30.9	31.1	31.8	30.2	30.0
Degree Obtained (percent)								
Ph.D.	84.7	92.0	68.7	58.6	93.4	86.0	81.4	80.0
MA or BA	15.3	8.0	30.0	39.1	6.7	14.0	17.2	20.0
No reply	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7

TABLE 13

Class Standing and Honors of Present and Former Teachers

(In percentages)

Class Rank and Honors	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
Class Standing								
A. High School								
Upper 10%	69.4	74.0	69.4	78.1	50.7	44.0	62.5	65.6
75-90%			27.4	19.5	27.4	36.0	22.7	20.7
Below 75%	27.4	18.0			18.7	20.0	10.6	11.0
No reply	3.4	8.0	3.4	2.2	3.3	0.0	3.3	3.5
B. College								
Upper 10%	58.0	60.0	57.4	67.3	40.7	42.0	51.5	56.6
75-90%	37.4	38.0	40.0	30.4	34.0	42.0	33.9	34.5
Below 75%					22.0	16.0	10.1	8.3
No reply	4.7	2.0	2.7	2.2	3.3	0.0	3.5	1.4
C. Graduate School								
Upper 10%	39.4	44.0	56.7	58.6	48.7	54.0	47.7	52.4
75-90%	42.0	46.0	28.0	30.4	34.0	30.0	32.3	33.1
Below 75%					9.3	10.0	5.1	6.2
No reply	18.7	10.0	15.3	10.9	8.0	6.0	13.9	9.0
Honors								
Cum Laude	12.0	24.0	20.0	15.2	14.0	16.0	15.2	18.6
Magna	10.0	16.0	11.3	8.7	6.7	4.0	9.2	9.7
Summa	8.0	10.0	8.7	6.5	3.3	8.0	6.6	8.3
Phi Beta Kappa	16.0	24.0	23.3	23.9	12.7	10.0	17.2	19.3
No reply	54.0	26.0	36.7	45.6	63.4	62.0	50.8	44.9

highly successful students. None of the items in this table differentiated between present teachers. The items having to do with number of schools were included on the hypothesis that high mobility might be related to later job decisions. This did not turn out to be the case. Most attended one school at each level. Ages at graduation from the several levels appear to be fairly typical although a bit young at graduation from secondary school. It is interesting to note the difference between the chemists and the others at the termination of graduate school.

Table 13 summarizes data related to academic progress. Although none of these variables differentiated between present and former teachers, it is apparent that these men were, for the most part, highly successful students. This fact, considered in the light of others such as middle class background and preferences for comparatively solitary activities, seems to be an important one in building the picture of the motivational structure of those who become college teachers. School, in which they are highly successful, becomes a rewarding experience and environment. Its acquisition of secondary reinforcement potentials is easily understood.

Table 14 describes the social activities engaged in by these men at various school levels. Most of them, it may be seen, fall into the "few" or "none" categories. This was borne out even more strongly in the interviews where the picture that emerged was of individuals who, many from a very early age, developed preferences for essentially solitary and intellectually demanding and stimulating activities. Reading was the activity most often cited. Others included such activities as chemistry sets, insect and stamp collections, radio construction, and amateur astronomy.

Table 15, which describes current social activities, yielded some differences between present and former teachers. The present teachers of English and the group as a whole reported more memberships and more interest in social activities. The one activity which accounted for most of the difference was church, something which makes the usual stereotype of the atheistic professor somewhat suspect. From the interviews, it was apparent that most of these men continued to prefer either isolated activities or to get together with a small group of like-minded friends.

Turning now to the occupational decisions themselves, it may be seen in Table 16 how and under what influences the decisions were made. The time at which the decision

TABLE 14

Social Activities During Secondary School, College and Graduate School of Present and Former Teachers

(In percentages)

Social Activities	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Present	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*	*Present*	*Former*
A. High School								
Several	28.7	28.0	44.0	39.1	39.4	36.0	37.0	34.5
Few	46.0	46.0	40.7	54.3	42.7	40.0	42.7	46.9
One	25.4	26.0	15.3	6.5	10.7	12.0	9.5	11.0
None					7.4	12.0	9.9	8.3
B. College								
Several	26.7	30.0	38.0	43.4	34.7	30.0	32.8	34.5
Few	54.7	58.0	50.7	47.7	46.0	44.0	49.9	50.4
One or none	18.7	12.0	11.3	8.7	19.3	26.0	9.7	15.9
C. Graduate School								
Several	7.3	14.0	9.3	15.2	45.4	50.0	12.1	16.6
Few	44.0	50.0	25.3	36.9			31.2	39.3
One	22.7	20.0	3.0	15.2	21.3	28.0	24.4	21.4
None	26.0	16.0	33.4	32.6	33.4	22.0	31.2	23.5

TABLE 15

Current Social Activities of Present and Former Teachers

(In percentages)

Current Social Activities	Chemistry		English		Psychology		Total	
	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former
Memberships[1]								
Church	71.4	70.0	65.4	41.2*	50.0	48.0	61.6	53.8*
PTA	30.7	46.0	18.0	34.7	28.0	28.0	25.3	36.6
Civic Club	14.7	18.0	12.7	21.7	19.3	22.0	15.4	20.7
Political	0.0	0.0	10.0	26.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	8.3
Health-Welfare	14.7	16.0	16.7	21.7	28.7	40.0	19.8	26.2
Youth	20.0	30.0	12.0	21.7	18.0	18.0	16.5	23.5
Other	12.7	30.0	18.0	28.2	11.3	22.0	13.9	26.9
Activities of Greatest Interest								
Church	40.7	40.0	34.7	13.0*	26.0	26.0	33.4	26.9*
PTA-Youth-Welfare	10.7	16.0	6.7	17.4	20.7	26.0	12.5	20.0
Lodges, Civic, Political	12.0	12.0	6.0	19.5	9.3	16.0	9.0	15.9
No reply	36.7	32.0	52.7	49.9	44.0	32.0	44.0	38.0
Offices Held								
Church	22.0	32.0	16.7	15.2	14.7	14.0	17.6	20.7
PTA-Youth-Welfare	9.3	24.0	5.3	15.2	16.0	18.0	10.1	19.3
Others	7.3	24.0	6.7	17.4	10.0	12.0	7.9	17.9
No reply	61.4	20.0	71.4	52.1	59.4	56.0	63.4	42.8

[1] Because, in some cases, more than one alternative was checked, the sum of the percentages exceeds 100.

was made did not differentiate between present and former teachers. This table has to do with the time at which the decision was made to teach. On the second item, however, which relates to the time when the decision about major field was made, there was a significant difference between present and former teachers. Those who chose the field earliest were most likely to remain in teaching. Whether this means that a relatively early commitment, made necessarily in the context of teaching, is a better omen for future teaching as a career is difficult to say. It seems a likely hypothesis.

The questionnaires and the interviews yielded somewhat different data with respect to those who were the major influences in the choice of teaching as a career. From the questionnaires, the picture that emerges is one in which the major locus of influence is the college or graduate teacher. Analysis of the questionnaire responses to this item failed to uncover any significant differences between present and former teachers. From the interviews, it seems that the major locus of influence is earlier. In addition, those who deny any such influence at all are more likely to be included among those who have left college teaching. An hypothesis of identification with a role figure suggests itself in this regard. The psychologists were most likely to deny any such influence, partly because their decisions come later (the subject is not usually taught in secondary schools), partly because psychologists, by their training and, perhaps, predispositions, are less likely to be willing to impute relatively simple causality in human affairs. In any case, both the questionnaires and the inter-

TABLE 16

Time and Influence Factors Involved in the Decision to Teach

(In percentages)

Decision about Teaching and Field	Chemistry		English		Psychology		Total	
	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former
When decision was made to enter teaching								
Junior College or before	16.0	12.0	70.7	60.8	16.0	14.0	18.0	11.7
Senior College	24.0	18.0			28.0	32.0	33.0	33.8
First half graduate school	14.7	22.0	12.7	19.5	18.7	12.0	15.2	17.9
Last half graduate school	19.3	18.0	15.3	13.0	21.3	26.0	14.1	16.6
After graduate school	24.0	30.0			15.3	16.0	17.4	18.6
Other	2.0	0.0	1.3	6.5	0.7	0.0	1.3	2.1
When decision was made about field								
Before BA	74.7	56.0*	62.7	39.1*	47.4	50.0*	60.9	50.0*
Graduate school	14.7	12.0	26.7	17.4	44.7	16.0	28.4	15.2
After	8.7	28.0	4.0	41.2	4.7	32.0	5.7	33.8
Other	2.0	4.0	6.7	2.2	3.3	2.0	4.0	2.8
Who influenced decision to enter teaching[1]								
Parents	28.7	18.0	37.4	32.6	27.3	24.0	30.8	24.8
Relatives and friends	16.7	18.0	24.7	30.4	22.7	18.0	21.1	22.1
High school teacher	18.0	16.0	24.7	21.7	6.7	18.0	16.3	18.6
College or graduate teacher	56.7	54.0	67.4	54.3	68.0	58.0	63.4	55.9
Administrator or counselor	10.0	20.0	14.0	13.0	20.0	14.0	14.5	15.9
Nature of Decision								
Chance	33.4	30.0	24.0	36.9	21.3	22.0	26.0	30.0
Uncertain	17.3	18.0	26.7	21.7	26.7	32.0	23.3	24.2
Planned	49.4	52.0	49.4	41.2	52.0	46.0	49.7	46.9
Amount of time in decision								
Little	47.4	48.0	48.7	52.1	46.7	56.0	47.1	52.4
Some	15.3	12.0	14.0	17.4	18.0	20.0	15.6	16.6
Much	37.4	40.0	37.4	30.4	35.4	24.0	36.3	31.7

[1] Because, in some cases, more than one alternative was checked, the sum of the percentages exceeds 100.

TABLE 17
Influences on Career Choices of Present and Former Teachers
(From Interviews)

	Chemistry				English				Psychology			
	College		University		College		University		College		University	
	Pres. (N-4)	For. (N-9)	Pres. (N-18)	For. (N-18)	Pres. (N-4)	For. (N-4)	Pres. (N-18)	For. (N-7)	Pres. (N-5)	For. (N-4)	Pres. (N-18)	For. (N-10)
Major Influence (percent citing)												
Parents(s)	0.0	0.0	5.6	11.2	0.0	50.0	16.8	14.3	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
Other relative	0.0	11.1	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
Teacher												
(a) Elementary	25.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(b) Secondary	50.0	22.2	16.8	11.2	50.0	0.0	22.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.2	0.0
(c) College	0.0	22.2	16.8	33.6	25.0	25.0	5.6	28.6	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
(d) Graduate	0.0	11.1	16.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	25.0	5.6	10.0
Other	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
None	0.0	33.3	33.6	39.2	0.0	0.0	28.0	57.2	60.0	75.0	39.2	80.0
Reactions to Teaching of (mean)												
Parents	4.3	3.9	3.4	3.9	3.8	4.3	3.4	3.5	3.8	2.7	3.3	3.4
Wife	4.3	3.7	4.3	3.4	3.8	5.0	4.2	4.5	4.4	3.0	4.5	3.2
Extent of Planning for Choice (mean)	1.5	2.4	3.7	3.8	2.0	1.3	2.7	1.5	1.0	2.5	2.7	2.1

views make it abundantly clear that it is principally teachers at several levels of the school system who serve as role models and who influence the decision to enter teaching as a career.

Returning to Table 17, the men were asked about the nature of the decision to become college teachers. Over half frankly admitted that it was a matter of chance. From the interviews, the impression was formed that this was a conservative figure, that the correct one would approach the two-thirds or three-quarters mark. However, the whole concept of chance or drift is a slippery one. What its use here probably means is that these men were unaware of any careful planning on their part prior to making the decision. In any choice system, however, the result is usually a function of a number of predisposing circumstances. Several of these have already been identified. At the same time, to rely on the sub-threshold operation of these influences to recruit the needed numbers of teachers is a course which has little to recommend it.

Finally, it may be seen that comparatively little time was devoted by most of these men to the decision to become a teacher. This is compatible with the results cited above. It is also somewhat supportive of the hypothesis that these men were, by a whole history of events, so predisposed to make the decisions they did that little time was required.

Table 17, already partially discussed, contains the results of the analyses of interview responses. In addition to the question of who was the major influence, reactions of wives and parents were elicited. These were rated on five point scales with a rating of 5 representing a highly favorable reaction to the choice of teaching. By and large, both parents and wives were very favorable, wives especially so. Recalling that the wives tend themselves to be well educated, this may be understood easily. There were some differences between the present and former teachers with the parents and wives of the present teachers being somewhat more favorable toward teaching. The last variable in this table relates to the extent of planning for a teaching career. It was rated on a five point scale where a 5 stands for careful planning. The averages indicate clearly what was said above: that the amount of planning was negligible. Slight differences exist between present and former teachers with the present teachers having, over-all, been somewhat more careful in their planning.

Table 18 contains some items having to do with the job histories of these men. Several significant differences may be observed. With respect to mobility, the first two items suggest what has already been alluded to: that former teachers show a consistently higher degree of movement. They have been employed in more institutions, and they have held, on the average, more positions.

TABLE 18
Employment Histories (Teaching Record)
(In Percentages)

Teaching Record	Chemistry		English		Psychology		Total	
	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.
Number of institutions in which employed								
1	49.4	54.0*	35.4	39.1	32.0	46.0	38.5	46.9*
2	19.3	34.0	28.7	19.5	28.0	40.0	25.1	31.7
3 or more	31.4	12.0	36.0	41.2	40.0	14.0	35.4	22.1
Number of positions held (mean)	3.4	4.3*	3.4	5.4*	3.9	4.8*	3.6	4.8*
Salary Increases on present job								
Less than $1000	38.7	14.0*	35.4	21.7	32.7	18.0	35.2	17.9*
$1000-3500	26.0	22.0	36.0	32.6	44.0	42.0	35.0	32.4
$3500-7000	24.7	36.0	23.3	23.9	18.7	20.0	22.0	26.9
$7000 or more	8.7	24.0	5.3	15.2	4.0	14.0	5.9	17.9
No reply	2.0	4.0	0.0	6.5	0.7	6.0	0.9	5.5
Years of teaching experience								
Less than 10	26.0	12.0*	37.4	19.5	38.0	36.0	33.4	22.8*
10-14	16.7	20.0	14.0	15.2	22.0	22.0	17.4	19.3
15-19	14.7	32.0	48.7	65.1	7.3	12.0	9.5	17.9
20 or more	42.7	36.0			32.7	30.0	38.7	40.7

Salary increases are associated with turnover in chemistry and for the group as a whole. As might be expected, those who had received the largest increases were less likely to have left teaching for other jobs. Differences between the disciplines are interesting to note in this respect. Another very interesting datum was the salary differential between teaching and non-teaching jobs. A quarter of those in chemistry and psychology and 42 per cent of those in English left for positions paying the same as *or less than* their teaching posts.

Years of teaching experience is related to the turn-over criterion in an interesting way. In chemistry and over-all, it is the younger, less experienced men who have most often left. This is understandable in that older men who have made their commitments to teaching have more responsibilities. It suggests, however, that programs need to be established for helping the younger men to overcome whatever obstacles they meet which seem to be insuperable.

Chapter Five

Job Activities and Reward Systems

IN THE PRECEDING CHAPTER we considered the backgrounds from which men in the sample group came. The reason for this was that decisions have histories, and it was felt that study of their backgrounds would provide some clues to understanding the decisions they have made. As noted earlier, motivation—the reasons why—is an intervening variable that can only be inferred from behavior, *never* studied directly.

In this chapter, reward systems—the values these men live by—will be considered along with the activities in which they engage. In tables included in Appendix D, the reward values of present and former college and university teachers are presented. The response categories A, B, C, D, and E are as follows:

A. How *important* each of the rewards is. Ratings were made on a five point scale from 5, extremely important, to 1, quite unimportant.
B. How *available* these rewards are (or were in the last teaching position). Ratings were made on a five point scale from 5, definitely available, to 1, almost or completely unavailable.
C. How important each reward was when the subjects were graduate students. Ratings were made on the same five point system as in A above.
D. How the availability of these rewards compare in college teaching as contrasted with business or industry. Ratings were made on a five point scale from 5, definitely more available in college teaching, to 1, definitely more available in government or industry.
E. The things to be considered in accepting a position in another institution (or, for former teachers, the things considered in deciding to leave teaching). Ratings were made on a five point scale from 5, highly important, to 1, unimportant.

In examining the mean scores (see Appendix D, Tables I to XII), it was apparent that a few items were rated high; moreover, there were differences often between adjacent ranks. Farther down, less important items tended to run together. For these reasons and because these tables contain so much information that trends are hard to see, a comparison of highest ranked reward values was developed. In this table, (Table 19) only the top ranked five (or, where there were tied ranks, top six or seven) rewards are presented. No distinction is made with respects to rank or mean value among these top ranked items within each response condition. The letters in each cell refer to the response conditions (see above). If a letter appears in a cell, it means that the item was ranked high by the group in question. This table simplifies the analysis of the reward structures without losing any appreciable amount of information.

Considering first response condition A (which rewards are of most importance), it may be seen that research is ranked high by all groups. To some extent, this is misleading. It is true that most college and university teachers having inquiring minds. They enjoy discovering new facts or ideas. On the other hand, it was apparent from the interviews that, for some, research interest is the socially appropriate thing. Some did not have a strong interest in research. To put it another way, most would do research but only under the most favorable conditions. The individuals who seemed to have high motivation to do research do it despite all manner of obstacles. They build their own equipment, they work evenings and week-ends. This is a nice problem for those who are interested in increasing research productivity, because a line must be drawn somewhere between those whose interest in research is so casual as to be ineffective and those who could, given a little encouragement and assistance, produce research.

At the same time, because teachers in higher education feel that research is important, those whose jobs effectively deny them the possibility of doing any often feel frustrated. Lack of opportunities to do research appears in some cases to be a convenient rationalization for other kinds of dissatisfactions.

Nothing in the above comments should, however, be taken to mean that the vast majority of teachers are not sincerely and genuinely motivated to do research. They are, and obstacles to doing it constitute real sources of dissatisfaction to them.

Another reward that is ranked high by all is the second, stimulation from colleagues. In the preceding chapter, when the matter of academic success was discussed, it was mentioned that the college or university as an environment acquires certain secondary reinforcing characteristics. Recalling also that teachers were, for most of these men, very important influences, it is easy to see why the intellectual atmosphere and the company of like-minded colleagues should be very important to them.

Another item ranked high by most is salary. When this study was being made, many were surprised that a study was needed at all. The answer to the recruitment and retention problems was so simple: money. It is perfectly true that money is heavily involved. At the same time, to assume that this is the sole or even dominant solution is to be seriously mistaken.

Salary seems to operate in an essentially curvilinear fashion. For the young instructor making $4,000 per year, an offer of $6,000 from industry or government constitutes a major attraction. To a man making $10,000, an offer of $12,000 is considered not so much in terms of salary differential as in terms of the other characteristics of the job. There seems to be a ratio effect. There also seems to be a set of limits. In the interviews, several men whose salaries were $9,000 or above said that *no* amount of money could attract them. They could, with considerable equanimity, turn down two or three times their present salaries.

The point seems to be that a salary at or beyond the comfort level is important. Beyond that, it ceases to be a real factor. Where the comfort, or subsistence, level is, varies from man to man, of course. Not very many teachers are at or above it at the present time. On the other hand, while substantial increases are clearly needed, the amounts of such increases are probably not anywhere near the figures often cited. At present living costs, a salary of $15,000 for professors would probably be adequate for the vast majority. As a matter of fact, several men mentioned that they hoped that the "super" salaries of $30-40,000 would *not* be established for fear that the "wrong" kinds of people would begin to be attracted to teaching. There is, still, a considerable carry-over of the monastic tradition in higher education although few teachers would care to admit it!

One other reward was ranked high by virtually all: independence. For the most part, college teachers are highly motivated, hard working individuals. They are, moreover, internally controlled. That is, they have their own ideas about what is important and what must be done. Because many are more expert in their fields than anyone else in the world, they naturally resent someone of lesser knowledge telling them what to do and how to do it. They work, but they insist on working when and how they feel it should be done. They want to choose their areas of work, not be told what is appropriate.

Table 19
Comparisons of Highest Ranked Reward Values

Rewards	*Chemistry*				*English*				*Psychology*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
	Stay	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*
Research	A C D E	A C D E	A B C D E	A C D E	A C D	A C D	A C D E	A C D E	A C D	A E	A C D E	A C D
Stimulating Colleagues	A C D E	A C	A B C E	A B C	A C D	A B C D	A C E	B C	A C D E	A B C D	A C D E	A B C D
Students		A C D	D	B D	A D	A D	D	B D	A D	C D	D	A B D
Salary	A E	A E		A E	A E	A C E	A E	A E	E	E	A E	A E
Status		B D						B	B			
Benefits	B	E			B	E	B					E
Security				E	B E	E	B	E	B	E		E
Congenial Social Group	B	B D	B		A B C E	A B C D	B	A B C	B	B D	B	
Work with Young People	A B D E	B D	B D	B D	A B C D E	A B D	B C D	D	A B D E	A B C D	B	B D
Independence	A B C E	A C	A B C D E	A B C D	A B C D E	A B C E	A B C E	A B C E	A B C E	A C D	B C D E	A B C D
Policy Making	D	E	E		A	A E				A		E
Freedom	D	C D	A C D E	C D	A E	C E	A B C D E	A D	B		B C D E	A B D
Recognition from Administration	B	B E		A E		E		E	C			
Recognition from Colleagues	B	B E		A	B		B			B C		C
Service	B					B			B	B E	B	B E
Advancement	C E	E		A E	C	E	E	C	C E	A E	A	
Chance to Contribute	C D		A B C	B C			D	D E	D	C D	A B C	C

The case of one chemistry teacher is interesting in this connection. After receiving his doctorate, he went to work for one of the better known chemical companies. There, he had an excellent salary and fine equipment. He was uncomfortable, however, because, as he put it, "I always felt that it would be better if I worked on something that would pay off for ________." He left and took a position in a well known university where his salary is much lower and his facilities are markedly poorer. To get the facilities needed for his research, he must get contracts. Agencies granting such funds often have problems in which they are interested and for which they want specific research. He therefore finds himself having lost some of the independence he sought in the university job. He is seriously considering returning to industry.

Certain other rewards are placed high by several of the groups. Teaching is one of these. It was interesting to note in the interviews how many former teachers had gone to considerable lengths to get some sort of teaching opportunities. Many were teaching night courses or were regularly driving many miles to offer a course in a college that needed them.Teaching was one of the activities which many of the former teachers missed most.

The next response category, B (which rewards are available or were so in the last teaching job), is interesting, particularly if a comparison is made with A, importance. Teaching, independence, and stimulation from colleagues are generally available. Research and adequate salary, which are important, are not. The stimulating and congenial social life of the campus is commonly available. So is recognition from colleagues. College teachers have a fairly tightly developed in-group; they are much more concerned with how their colleagues evaluate them than they are with others' reactions. The attitude is often the despair of administrators and particularly public relations officers! It is also related to the distribution of such rewards as salary increments and rank increases. This will be discussed later in detail.

Response category C, rewards of importance during graduate days, shows that, in general, the values these men have now are the ones they had when students. It would be interesting to explore this matter in depth and see at what point these reward values, which predispose the individual to make the often almost reflex decision to become a teacher, are well developed. Such information would be of considerable use in the recruitment process. Research, stimulating colleagues, and independence are the three values which most ranked high as graduate students.

The manner in which response category D was set up meant that an item was ranked high if it were more available in teaching than in government or industry. It is interesting to see research ranked high by most. Work with students is also ranked high, understandably, as is the opportunity to influence young people. In this connection, there seems to be a fairly strong proselytizing need in the college teacher, a wish to recruit others to share the same values. It is still true in most graduate departments that the best students are strongly encouraged to accept academic appointments.

As another way to analyze the reward systems, a series of rank order correlation coefficients were computed among the various response categories. These are contained in Table 20. In an ideal job, the correlations between response categories A (importance) and B (availability) would be high, approaching the limit of 1.00. A quick examination of the first column of Table 20 will show that these correlations are far from 1.00. In fact, several are *negative*, and a number are essentially zero. There seems to be no consistent pattern between the present and former teachers. It was expected that these correlations would have been higher for the present teachers. In some cases they are, in others not.

TABLE 20
Intercorrelations Among Selected Reward Value Categories

Groups	*A/B Importance and availability*	*A/C Importance and feeling when a student*	*A/D Importance and availability in govt. or industry*	*A/E Importance and weight in job consideration*	*B/C Availability and feeling when a student*	*B/E Availability and weight in job consideration*
I. College Teachers						
A. Present						
1. Chemistry	—.17	.68	.72	.80	.01	—.29
2. English	.02	.70	.61	.81	—.13	.17
3. Psychology	—.17	.58	.64	.82	.08	—.11
B. Former						
1. Chemistry	—.23	.80	.13	.17	.52	—.58
2. English	.17	.61	.34	—.02	.67	—.50
3. Psychology	—.02	.46	.30	.01	.57	—.46
II. University Teachers						
A. Present						
1. Chemistry	.55	.88	.61	.71	.58	.22
2. English	.05	.74	.47	.81	.12	—.09
3. Psychology	—.25	.47	.26	.71	.30	—.11
B. Former						
1. Chemistry	.22	.76	.10	.46	.76	—.57
2. English	.07	.90	.44	.31	.57	—.67
3. Psychology	.23	.78	.50	—.08	.64	—.61

The second column (A/C) shows the relationships between present value systems and the value systems held as graduate students. For the most part, these correlations are moderately high, indicating considerable similarity.

The next column (A/D) is one which perhaps goes a long way to account for the fact that so many teachers remain in teaching. While many rewards of importance are not available in teaching (A/B), they are at least thought to be *more* available there than in government or industry. Here, the correlations conformed to the hypotheses in that those for present teachers are somewhat higher than for former teachers. The tragedy here is that, while the former teachers failed to find in teaching the things they wanted most, they have also for the most part failed to find them in non-teaching positions. This is why a substantial number (see Chapter 7) are interested in returning to teaching or would if they could.

Column A/E demonstrates this further. For the present teachers, the things they would consider about another teaching job are similar to the ways they rank the rewards in terms of importance. In other words, they would move elsewhere to get things that are important to them. For the former teachers, however, the correlations are quite low, several being essentially zero. What they found in industry did not correspond very well to what they really think is important. One gets an impression that, having found the teaching position intolerable, they seized on a single reward such as money or research opportunities, and forfeited the others for it.

The availability of rewards, when compared with the reward system as a graduate student (B/C), shows an interesting reversal. The coefficients are somewhat higher for former than for present teachers. This suggests that present teachers are more disillusioned, perhaps. It may, however, be an example of the old oaken bucket illusion among the former teachers.

The generally negative correlations in the last column (B/E) suggests that decisions to leave involve a search for values not available in the present job. There is nothing particularly startling about this finding, but it documents again the importance of these reward systems in determining behavior.

Although comparisons among the three academic groups studied are not the major focus of this study, Table 21 was set up to show similarities and differences among the disciplines and between the present and former teachers. Examining this table will show some interesting clusters. The entries are rank order correlation coefficients. The clusters that may be seen tend to agree with the impressions of the interviewers who felt that differences among the three disciplines were marked and often greater than those between present and former teachers within any single field.

Another view of the reward structures of college teachers was obtained from administrators. In fairness to the administrators, it must be said that they were asked to describe the typical reward values of their faculties, a task which forced them into stereotypes. However, such stereotypes do exist and are often brought into play in making decisions about faculty personnel policies and practices. For this reason, it was felt that such ratings might be interesting.

TABLE 21
Comparative Analysis of Reward Value Structures

	Response Categories				
Comparison group (for rank difference correlation)	*A (Importance)*	*B (Availability)*	*C (Importance when grad. student)*	*D (Availability in teaching or elsewhere)*	*E (Importance in decision)*
Rank difference correlations between:					
1. College and University					
A. Present					
1. Chemistry	.70	.35	.87	.89	.55
2. English	.86	.70	.89	.92	.57
3. Psychology	.47	.46	.81	.84	.68
B. Former					
1. Chemistry	.77	.34	.84	.84	.82
2. English	.76	.67	.65	.85	.71
3. Psychology	.54	.45	.61	.86	.75
2. Disciplines					
A. College (present)					
1. Chemistry-English	.73	.88	.77	.89	.66
2. Chemistry-Psychology	.83	.80	.87	.89	.85
3. English-Psychology	.90	.86	.72	.95	.80
B. College (former)					
1. Chemistry-English	.68	.65	.75	.79	.71
2. Chemistry-Psychology	.61	.72	.45	.62	.72
3. English-Psychology	.68	.82	.49	.78	.63
C. University (present)					
1. Chemistry-English	.88	.78	.83	.84	.80
2. Chemistry-Psychology	.57	.67	.83	.88	.73
3. English-Psychology	.56	.55	.80	.84	.87
D. University (former)					
1. Chemistry-English	.59	.69	.76	.83	.87
2. Chemistry-Psychology	.73	.69	.85	.89	.78
3. English-Psychology	.68	.43	.81	.91	.73
3. Present and Former					
A. College					
1. Chemistry	.79	.71	.80	.76	.26
2. English	.82	.44	.85	.83	.39
3. Psychology	.68	.52	.49	.80	.17
B. University					
1. Chemistry	.70	.69	.84	.91	.47
2. English	.75	.33	.88	.93	.49
3. Psychology	.73	.42	.75	.85	.17

Table 22 contains the mean values and ranks of the various rewards. The response conditions are as follows:

A. How important each reward is to the faculty. These were rated on a five point scale with a 5 indicating extremely important.

TABLE 22
Faculty Reward Values as Reported by Administrators

	Importance				*Availability*				*Availability in Teaching or Elsewhere*				*Rewards Most Concerned with Improving*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
	mean	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*	*mean*	*rank*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.6	2.0	4.2	3.5	4.2	1.0	3.9	1.0	3.6	1.5	3.9	2.0	4.1	1.0	4.0	2.5
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.2	1.0	3.9	7.5	2.6	15.0	2.7	13.5	3.6	1.5	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.9	5.0
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	3.1	5.5	3.3	16.0	3.5	3.0	3.4	5.0	2.6	13.0	3.5	5.0	3.2	8.0	4.0	2.5
4. Advising undergraduate students	3.2	3.5	4.3	2.0	2.7	14.0	2.5	15.5	3.2	6.5	2.9	8.5	3.2	8.0	3.0	9.5
5. Advising graduate students	3.2	3.5	3.6	15.0	2.9	10.5	3.1	9.5	2.6	13.0	2.7	11.0	2.9	12.5	3.0	9.5
6. Serving on departmental committees	2.7	11.5	3.7	12.5	2.4	16.0	2.3	17.0	2.7	10.0	2.4	14.0	2.8	14.0	2.6	13.5
7. Serving on university or college committees	2.8	10.0	4.2	3.5	2.3	17.0	2.5	15.5	3.0	8.0	2.8	10.0	3.2	8.0	3.0	9.5
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	3.1	5.5	2.7	12.5	3.1	7.0	3.2	8.0	2.6	13.0	3.1	6.5	3.2	8.0	3.4	6.0
9. Conducting your own research	2.7	11.5	3.8	9.5	3.5	3.0	3.8	2.0	3.5	3.0	3.9	2.0	3.7	3.5	4.0	2.5
10. Counseling with students	2.9	8.5	4.4	1.0	2.8	13.0	2.8	12.0	3.4	4.0	2.9	8.5	3.3	5.0	3.0	9.5
11. Writing professional books, articles	2.6	13.5	3.8	9.5	3.4	5.0	3.5	3.5	3.3	5.0	3.9	2.0	3.8	2.0	4.0	2.5
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	2.5	15.0	3.7	12.5	3.0	8.0	3.3	6.5	2.7	10.0	3.1	6.5	3.2	8.0	3.2	7.0
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	2.9	8.5	4.1	5.0	2.9	10.5	3.6	11.0	2.5	15.0	2.0	15.0	2.5	15.0	2.3	16.0
14. Consulting with industry or government	2.6	13.5	4.0	6.0	3.2	6.0	3.3	6.5	2.1	16.0	1.9	16.0	2.3	16.0	2.3	16.0
15. Administration	2.3	16.5	3.0	17.0	2.9	10.5	2.7	13.5	2.7	10.0	2.5	13.0	2.9	12.5	2.6	13.5
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	3.0	7.0	3.9	7.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.2	6.5	2.6	12.0	3.2	8.0	2.8	12.0
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	2.3	16.5	3.7	12.5	2.9	10.5	3.1	9.5	2.0	17.0	1.8	17.0	2.2	17.0	2.3	16.0
Correlation (Rho)—colleges and universities	.32				.96				.73				.88			

B. How available these rewards are to their faculty members. The ratings were on a five point scale with a 5 indicating definitely available.

C. How the availability of these rewards in each institution compares with their availability government or industry. The ratings were on a five point scale with a 5 indicating definitely more available in the institution.

D. Which rewards the administrator was most concerned with improving for his faculty. The ratings were made on a five point scale with a 5 indicating most important to improve.

At the bottom of the table are the correlations between the ratings of college and university administrators. Except for column A (importance) the coefficients are quite high. In general, the administrators agree on the other response conditions.

Table 23 contains the intercorrelations among the various response conditions based on administrators' ratings. The first column (A/B) shows clearly that the administrators agree that there is little or no correspondence between what faculty members regard as important and the rewards that are available. Unlike faculty members, they are not even certain (column A/C) that the rewards of importance are not about as available in government or industry as in teaching. The college administrators are somewhat more insightful than their university colleagues in terms of the rewards that must be improved (A/D). That is, the rewards that the college administrators feel must be improved correspond to an appreciable extent with what they feel the faculty wants most. The question remains (and will be discussed below), however, whether their perceptions of the importance of these rewards to the faculty are correct.

TABLE 23
Intercorrelations Among Reward Value Response Conditions as Rated by Administrators

	Conditions					
	A/B[1]	*A/C*	*A/D*	*B/C*	*B/D*	*C/D*
College	.03	.38	.44	.07	.33	.88
University	—.08	.10	—.01	.47	.50	.98

[1] A/B refers to the (rank order) correlation between arrays A (administrator rating of what faculty feels is important) and B (administrator rating of the availability of those rewards to faculty), etc.

The next column (B/C) describes the relationship between availability of rewards in teaching and their availability elsewhere. A high positive correlation would indicate that the rewards were most available in teaching. The college administrators appear to be unsure; the university administrators are less so. The correlations between what is available and what must be improved (B/D) suggest that the administrators are thinking along "more-of-the-same" lines. On the other hand, in their defense, they are also concerned with improving the availability of those rewards that are generally characteristic of the teaching situation (C/D).

The crucial question, however, has to do with the extent of correspondence between the perceptions of administrators and the self-ratings of the faculty. These relationships are examined in Table 24. Only two response conditions (importance, and availability) are included because the other ratings were made in response to directions that make comparisons meaningless. Examining the first row (for response condition, importance), one may see that the correlations, while positive, are not particularly impressive in their magnitude. There is no detectable pattern of differences between present and former teachers or between college and university personnel. The correlations range from .25 to .82.

The real discrepancy comes in the condition which is concerned with the availability of the rewards. These coefficients are very low. This shows quite clearly that the faculty and administration simply do not agree on the matter of the availability of rewards. A comment here about the communication pattern may help to explain this. By and large, upward and downward communication in most institutions is poor. It is therefore not at all surprising that the faculty and administration are shouting at each other across a great gulf. Under such circumstances, a disagreement on such a basic issue is understandable—although obviously not desirable.

While interview responses relating to reward values have been alluded to earlier, tables 25 and 26 contain an explicit analysis of these responses. The questions were phrased in a somewhat different way than in the questionnaires so that the results are not directly and totally comparable. Nevertheless, they are illuminating.

The first question concerned the characteristics of the ideal job. It was interesting that many faculty members had extreme difficulty with this question. Only with care and patience were some interviewees encouraged to respond with carefully thought out answers. Most often, the present teachers replied that their present jobs—with some modifications—were satisfactory. Contrary to popular opinion, most faculty members are very modest in their demands. When the former teachers indicated that a teaching job would be ideal, they typically specified less teaching load and more upper class and graduate teaching. Quite a number of present teachers were interested in

TABLE 24
Comparison of Faculty and Administration
Rating of Values in a Teaching Career
(Rank difference correlations)

	Chemistry				*English*				*Psychology*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
	Pres.	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*
Importance of selected rewards					.30	.28	.55	.49	.82	.25	.49	.30
Availability of rewards	.18	.12	.28	.41	.26	.07	.05	.19	.14	.09	.23	.19

TABLE 25

Values and Rewards of Teaching Career
Listed by Present Teachers (Interviews)

	Chemistry		*English*		*Psychology*	
	Col. (N-4)	*Univ. (N-18)*	*Col. (N-4)*	*Univ. (N-18)*	*Col. (N-5)*	*Univ. (N-18)*
Ideal job (times cited)						
I. In Teaching						
a. same	3	9	3	9	3	7
b. more graduate & upper class	1	2	0	7	0	9
c. less teaching	1	5	1	6	0	10
d. more research	2	6	1	8	0	10
e. different school	1	2	2	1	1	2
f. other	2	3	2	9	2	7
II. Non-Teaching[1]						
a. same						
b. more research						
c. less administration						
d. more administration						
e. other						
Importance of intellectual community (mean)	3.3	3.2	2.8	2.8	3.4	3.1
Rewards outside teaching (No.)						
a. money	3	10	1	6	3	9
b. research opportunity	1	6	0	0	0	6
c. other	0	0	0	2	1	1
d. not interested	3	11	4	15	4	12
Range of rewards in teaching (mean)	3.3	2.8	2.5	2.5	3.4	3.5

[1] None of the present teachers described an ideal job outside of teaching.

TABLE 26

Values and Rewards of Teaching Career
Listed by Former Teachers (Interviews)

	Chemistry		*English*		*Psychology*	
	Col. (N-9)	*Univ. (N-20)*	*Col. (N-4)*	*Univ. (N-7)*	*Col. (N-4)*	*Univ. (N-10)*
Ideal job (times cited)						
I. In Teaching						
a. same	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. more graduate & upper class	0	8	1	0	1	3
c. less teaching	0	8	1	0	1	3
d. more research	0	6	1	0	0	3
e. different school	0	0	1	0	2	2
f. other	0	6	0	0	1	2
II. Non-Teaching						
a. same	8	9	3	7	1	5
b. more research	2	3	0	0	2	0
c. less administration	0	1	0	0	0	0
d. more administration	0	3	0	1	0	0
e. other	1	2	0	0	2	1
Importance of intellectual community (mean)	3.1	3.9	4.5	4.6	3.3	3.6
Rewards outside teaching (No.)						
a. money	7	13	3	5	3	8
b. research opportunity	3	10	0	1	1	8
c. other	4	3	3	5	3	5
d. not interested	0	0	0	0	0	0
Range of rewards in teaching (mean)	2.3	3.8	1.5	2.6	1.8	2.0

better salaries (included under "other"). Many of the former teachers said that their present jobs, while not really ideal, were as ideal as practical considerations of money could make them.

Another item had to do with the intellectual community and its importance. Over-all, the former teachers rated this higher (on a five point scale) than present teachers. This appeared to be partly a matter of response to deprivation. Present teachers take for granted what former teachers have learned to miss.

The rewards outside of teaching were seen by the present teachers to consist mainly in better salaries and better research facilities. Most, however, indicated that, these things to the contrary notwithstanding, they were not interested. The former teachers agreed that money and better research opportunities were available.

This matter of research opportunities is, as was mentioned earlier, an interesting problem. In at least the two sciences studied, chemistry and psychology, colleges have virtually lost their place as sources of significant advances in knowledge, and universities are in considerable danger of doing so. In the sciences, the availability of research contracts has staved off this situation, but even they are not sufficient. Several chemists, particularly those in physical chemistry, said that to do really important and original research, two things were virtually essential: a security clearance and an appointment every summer or every two or three years to a place such as Los Alamos or Oak Ridge. Comparatively few universities can support the tremendous costs of the research in several of the sciences. The situation in psychology is not yet as critical, but even here, there are some problems on which research cannot be done without very expensive equipment.

One might reply that, as long as free rein is given to scientists in these laboratories, basic research, even if not done on the campus, will still get done and will ultimately be made available. The problem is not that simple. Security restrictions, which trouble many scientists, make the results effectively unavailable, particularly to students, for years. Many men cannot or do not wish to pack their families off to Tennessee or New Mexico; they would prefer to remain on their home campuses where they can also teach and work with graduate students. It is these graduate students to whom we must look for our future teachers. If they must spend several post-doctoral years in these huge laboratories in order to attain expertness in their fields, we will lose many otherwise promising teachers. It is a difficult problem.

The last item in Tables 25 and 26 has to do with the range of rewards in teaching. Basically, the question was whether there is enough effective range in rewards, particularly in salary, to provide a man with a lifetime of incentives. In general, the answer was in the negative. With the increasing competition for faculty members resulting in very rapid promotions, a thirty-year-old professor is by no means uncommon, even in first rate schools. From then on, the institution can offer him nothing but (perhaps) the opportunity to keep up with the cost of living. Of course, he may get more attractive consultantships, but this is a two-edged sword. Good consultants are often offered full-time positions.

A number of those interviewed felt that, though the range was too small, it was not really a problem. Their feeling was that, once a man makes the top rung in the ladder, his intrinsic interest and satisfactions in research and teaching are enough. They probably are for many—but not all. Several able and ambitious young men who had reached the top or who had it in sight were concerned with this very problem.

With some picture of the values of college and university teachers in mind, consideration of their job activities may be undertaken. What they do is to some extent a function of their value systems; what they would like to do is even more so. Tables XIII to XXIV detail the activities of present and former teachers. The response categories are as follows:

A. The actual amount of time actually spent in the activity. Ratings were made on a five point scale with a 5 representing half time or more and a 1 less than five per cent time.

B. The amount of time they would *like* to spend in each activity. Ratings were made on a five point scale with a 5 standing for "a great deal more than at present."

C. How, when a graduate student, the man *expected* to spend his time when he becomes a college teacher. Ratings were on a five point system the same as A above.

D. The way the faculty member feels that the administration *actually* weighs these activities in deciding on such matters as promotions and salary increases. Ratings were on a five point scale with a 5 representing very heavily weighted, 1 standing for almost totally ignored.

E. The way faculty members feel that these activities *ought* to be weighed in making decisions as in D above.

As with the other appendix tables, these tables, while containing a great deal of information, are difficult to read for trends. Consequently, a table was set up (Table 27) to present only those job activities that were ranked highest under the various response conditions. This table contains only those items ranked in the top five (or, where there were tied ranks, the top six or seven). The letters in each cell represent the response conditions.

Considering first response condition A (amount of time actually devoted to each activity), it is apparent that teaching occupies a large proportion of the time of

Table 27
Comparisons of Highest Ranked Job Activities by Major Field

Activity	*Chemistry*				*English*				*Psychology*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
	Stay	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*	*Stay*	*Leave*
Teaching upper division courses	A B C D E	A B C E	A C D E	A B C D E	A C D E	A B C D E	A C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	A C D E	A B C E
Teaching lower division courses	A C D E	A C D E	A C D E	A C E	A C D E	A C	A C E	A C D E	A C D E	A C D E	A C D E	A C
Teaching graduate courses and seminars	C	C	A B C	A B C D E	B E	B D E	A B C D	A B C D E	A B C D E	A C E	A C D E	A B C D E
Advising undergraduate students		A D E			A	A E	A			A B E	C	
Advising graduate students		B			B D					C		C E
Serving on departmental committees	D											
Supervising graduate dissertations	D		B		D	D			D	D		D
Conducting your own research	A	B D E	A B C D	A C D E			B E			E	B E	B E
Counseling with students	A B C E	B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	B C E	B C E	A B C D E	A B C D E	B C E	A B C	A B C D E	A B C D E
Writing professional books, articles	A	A B			A B C	A		A	A C E	A B C		
Serving as an officer or committee member in group(s)	B C D E	B D	B D E	B D	B C D E	B C D E	B D E	B C D E	B D E	B C D E	A B D	B D
Participating in community activities												
Consulting with industry or government												
Administration	B	B										
Reading professional books, articles, etc.	D				D	D	D			D		D
Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	B C E	A C	B E	A B	A B C	A B C	A C	A B	A B C	A	B C	A B

all (or did, in the last academic job, for the former teachers). Conducting research and reading professional books and articles are other activities that are ranked high for most groups. These last two appearing among the highest ranks raises questions about the often heard complaints regarding insufficient time for research and reading. It is true, generally, that these items occupy much less time than does teaching, and it is also true that many men felt that their teaching loads were far too heavy.

The activities in which they would *like* to spend their time (B) are: teaching, particularly upper division, research, writing, and reading. It is interesting to speculate about why writing, which is a common sequel to research and reading, should appear among the list of things they would like to do and not among the list of things they actually do. Anyone who has done much experimental or scholarly research is aware that the writing part is usually much less time consuming than is the collection of the data.

The things they expected to do when graduate students looking forward to a teaching career include teaching, research, and reading. These are, considering what is actually done, fairly realistic expectations.

The highest ranked items having to do with what administrators (in this faculty view of things) actually consider in making promotions and salary increases (category D) include teaching, research, serving on institutional committees, writing, and, fairly often, administration. Two of these, serving on committees and administration, are certainly not among the highest ranked items in terms of faculty preferences. In addition, there was considerable bitterness expressed about the evaluation of teaching. Many men felt that much lip service is paid to good teaching but that no one takes the trouble to find out whether a man is a good teacher or not. Worse, they feel, the real pay-off is in terms of "academic yardage" or else serving in committee and administrative tasks. Commonly used indices of teaching effectiveness seem to be enrollment in elective classes, a reasonable distribution of grades, and an absence of serious or frequent complaints.

It will be recalled from the earlier discussion of values that most college teachers genuinely like to work with young people, to influence them. This activity is the single, most time-consuming thing that most faculty members do. Their bitterness at haphazard evaluation of their teaching effectiveness is therefore understandable.

Finally, their picture of how various activities *ought* to be weighed in making personnel decisions (E) includes, among the highest ranked items, teaching, research, and writing. Some of the former teachers felt that advising undergraduates ought to be considered, and several groups, especially the former teachers, also felt that directing theses ought to be considered.

Table 28 contains rank order correlations among the various response categories. The correlations between the amount of time actually spent and the amount of time they would *like* to spend (A/B) are, for the most part, low. Two are negative, and three are essentially zero. Generally speaking, the correlations generated by the former teachers are higher than those of the present teachers, perhaps another example of the old oaken bucket illusion.

The correlations between how they spend their time and the way they expected to spend their time when they were graduate students (A/C) are moderately high. This suggests that graduate students have a fairly realistic picture of the life they will lead when they become teachers. Whether this (especially in view of the A/B coefficients) constitutes a recruitment incentive or not is a moot point.

Correlations between the way they spend their time and the items that are actually weighted in administrators' minds in making promotions (A/D) are moderately high. Here, in line with the hypothesis, the coefficients generated by former teachers are lower than those for present teachers. Generally speaking, the coefficients between the way they spend their time and what they feel ought to be considered in making personnel decisions (A/E) are

TABLE 28
Intercorrelations Among Selected Activities Scales
(Rank difference correlations)

	Response Categories							
Groups	*A/B*[1]	*A/C*	*A/D*	*A/E*	*B/C*	*B/D*	*B/E*	*D/E*
I. College Teachers								
A. Present								
1. Chemistry	—.06	.50	.07	.45	.49	—.53	.29	.22
2. English	.08	.76	.25	.37	.53	—.04	.64	.27
3. Psychology	.34	.86	.64	.79	.62	.36	.64	.76
B. Former								
1. Chemistry	—.17	.35	.33	.28	.41	.13	.39	.77
2. English	.17	.77	.22	.47	.55	.27	.50	.53
3. Psychology	.75	.85	.13	.63	.88	—.04	.47	.30
II. University Teachers								
A. Present								
1. Chemistry	.45	.82	.55	.80	.81	.33	.62	.66
2. English	.09	.75	.62	.72	.44	.34	.46	.64
3. Psychology	.06	.91	.75	.79	.53	.27	.55	.77
B. Former								
1. Chemistry	.41	.82	.49	.81	.46	.31	.44	.70
2. English	.37	.71	.35	.60	.78	.38	.72	.67
3. Psychology	.31	.81	.07	.61	.60	.28	.50	.33

[1] A/B represents the (rank difference) correlation between A (the relative amount of time actually spent in activity) and B (the faculty's preference for how they would *like* to spend their time), etc.

moderately high. In most cases, those for the present teachers are higher than those for the former teachers, a finding in line with the hypothesis.

There are, however, a number of discrepancies. Quite a few faculty members resent the inadequate evaluation of teaching and even more the "pay-off" for committee work and administrative tasks.

A very serious situation is brought to light by the correlations between what they would like to do and what is actually rewarded (B/D). For the most part, these are low, and at least three are zero or negative. No consistent differences appeared between present and former teachers.

An intriguing set of relationships came to light in the correlations between what they would like to do and what they feel ought to be rewarded (B/E). In effect, this is a description of the ideal job in which one is rewarded for doing what he wants to do. One might expect that these correlations would closely approximate 1.00. Although they are moderately high, they are far from unity.

This relates to the earlier mentioned fact that many teachers and former teachers had extreme difficulty in describing the ideal job. These correlations suggest that teachers themselves are in conflict about their own occupational situations, not being entirely clear about what they really want. Small wonder that administrators have difficulties even when they are highly motivated and reasonably able to establish policies and practices for the presumed benefit of their faculty members. It is interesting to compare these correlations with those generated by the last response condition, the one comparing what is considered and what ought to be considered in making evaluations for promotions and salary increases (D/E). They are just about as high as the ones presumably describing the ideal job.

Table 29 was developed from administrators' ratings of what their faculty members did. As was true in Table 22, a certain amount of stereotyping was virtually built into this table by asking administrators for typical job patterns, but such stereotypes do, as has been amply demonstrated elsewhere, operate in many situations.

The response conditions included in this table are as follows:

A. How the faculty members actually spend their time. Ratings were made on a five point scale, the same as for A in the appendix tables.
B. How the faculty would like to spend their time. Ratings were made on a five point scale, the same as in the appendix tables.
C. How the various activities are actually weighted in making decisions about promotion or salary increases. Ratings were on a five point scale with a 5 representing very heavily weighted.
D. How these activities ought to be weighted in making such decisions. Ratings were the same as for C above.

The correlations between college and university administrators are presented at the bottom of the table. Except for the first (how the faculty actually spend their time), agreement was substantial. Agreement on the bases of making decisions about promotions and salary increases (category C) was especially high.

Table 30 contains the results of correlating administrators' ratings relative to faculty activities across the various response conditions. The coefficients in general

TABLE 30
Intercorrelations of Administrators' Ratings of Faculty Activities
(Rank difference correlations)

	Conditions					
	A/B[1]	*A/C*	*A/D*	*B/C*	*B/D*	*C/D*
College	—.21	—.30	.59	—.33	—.54	—.35
University	.01	.22	.27	.10	—.60	—.35

[1] Represents administrators' rankings: correlation between ranking of how faculty actually spend time and how faculty would like to spend time, etc.

TABLE 29
Faculty Job Activities as Reported by Administrators

	Actual time spent by faculty		*Preferred way of spending time by faculty*		*How activities are actually rewarded*		*Activities that ought to be rewarded*	
	College mean	*University mean*	*College mean*	*University mean*	*College mean*	*University mean*	*College mean*	*University mean*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.6	3.9	3.3	4.0	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.7
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.4	2.8
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.9	2.3	3.6	3.6	4.6	4.9	3.4	3.4
4. Advising undergraduate students	3.4	1.6	3.3	3.1	1.6	1.6	4.6	4.6
5. Advising graduate students	3.1	1.2	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2
6. Serving on departmental committees	2.8	1.1	3.8	4.0	2.7	2.2	3.2	2.9
7. Serving on university or college committees	3.0	1.3	4.2	4.3	3.5	3.5	2.9	2.4
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	2.9	1.5	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.0	2.4	2.4
9. Conducting your own research	2.9	1.9	4.6	4.3	4.8	4.6	2.5	2.3
10. Counseling with students	3.1	1.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	2.5	2.1
11. Writing professional books, articles	2.7	1.6	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.2	2.3	2.6
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	2.5	1.1	3.7	3.7	4.4	4.5	2.0	2.3
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	3.0	1.5	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.8	2.5	2.8
14. Consulting with industry or government	2.8	1.1	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.7	2.6	2.5
15. Administration	2.2	1.3	4.1	4.2	3.6	3.1	2.3	2.3
16. Reading professoinal books, articles, etc.	3.2	1.9	4.0	4.2	2.9	2.5	3.0	2.6
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	2.4	1.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.4	2.9
Correlation (rank difference)—colleges and universities	.64		.80		.97		.84	

indicate very serious problems since many of them are either zero or actually negative. For example, the correlation between what administrators believe faculty members do and what they believe they would like to do (A/B) are negative for college administrators and zero for those in universities. It is as one administrator said: "I have a feeling that I am presiding over an unjust situation which I cannot change."

The correlations between what they think faculty members do and what is considered in making promotions (A/C) are about the same, slightly worse in the colleges, somewhat better in the universities. At least in the universities, there is about a 5 per cent correspondence between what gets done and what gets rewarded!

Both sets of administrators agree moderately well on which activities ought to be rewarded and feel, strangely enough, that there is a better relationship here (A/D) than in the previous set of correlations (A/C). What they are saying is that the things that occupy faculty members' time ought to be rewarded.

They admit (perhaps without realizing it) that the relationship between what faculty members would like to do and what is actually rewarded (B/C) is extremely poor. The next set of correlations (B/D) is even more interesting, because it shows a major lack of correspondence between what faculty members would like to do and what they (the administrators) believe ought to be rewarded. It is a kind of tacit confession that the reward system in higher education is seriously out of kilter. Finally, the correlations between what is and what the administration thinks ought to be rewarded (C/D) are significantly negative.

As was true with reward values, the real question is whether the faculty and administration see the problems in approximately the same way. Recognizing a bad situation for what it is, is frequently one good way to begin to remedy it. Table 31 contains correlations between faculty rankings and the rankings of the administrators. It may be seen that most are quite low, indicating a serious lack of agreement. Generally speaking, the coefficients describing the correspondence on ratings about actual job duties (A) are fairly high. The faculty and administration agree on how the faculty members spend their time. Considering how they would like to spend their time, however, (B) the coefficients are quite low and in several cases negative. It is one thing to know what a man does; it is much harder to learn what he would like to do. The poor communication channels already referred to are probably at fault here.

In terms of what is actually considered in making promotion or salary increase decisions, the correlations are again fairly low (C). This means that, to a certain extent, the faculty is bucking a game whose rules they do not understand. This sort of situation can result, as studies in the effects of aperiodic and irrational reinforcement show, in some disintegrative behavior. The decision to escape from a conflict situation is common. Neither do administrators correctly perceive what the faculty believes ought to be rewarded (D). Again, most of the coefficients are low, and some are negative.

Considering the major discrepancies between the ways in which faculty members spend their time, how they would like to spend their time, what is rewarded, what they feel ought to be rewarded, and the perceptions of their administrators of these feelings and activities, it seems not unfair to say that the conditions of work in college teaching are in a pitiable state of affairs. The interesting thing is not that so many men have left teaching; it is, rather, that so many have stayed. This can be understood, at least in part, by referring back to the discussion of reward values, for it is *only* in teaching, despite its many shortcomings, that these men can obtain access to those rewards that are of greatest importance to them. They like to teach and work with young people; they like to read, study, and advance knowledge. They are paying a high price for the privilege of doing these things which, if we are to believe what we hear, this country needs in greatly increased amounts.

Table 32 contains the analysis of certain other activities. Of the first three items—papers read, papers published, and books published—only the second differentiated between present and former teachers. In chemistry, those who have published most are more heavily represented among those who have left teaching. Although the differences are not significant, the same trends seem to hold in the other disciplines. This may relate to the matter discussed earlier of universities and colleges losing their pre-eminent places as sources of new knowledge, where men highly motivated to advance knowledge—particularly in chemistry, which requires much expensive apparatus—leave for better opportunities. If so, it is sad indeed.

Memberships in professional associations, the next item, also differentiated significantly between the present and former teachers, at least in chemistry and English. Those who left were less likely to have been members of regional associations. Membership in these is often, although not always, a sign of an involvement with a region and its

TABLE 31
Comparisons Between Faculty and Administrator
Ratings of Activities
(Rank difference correlations)

Category	Chemistry				English				Psychology			
	College		University		College		University		College		University	
	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.	Pres.	For.
Actual time distribution	.60	.72	.72	.83	.60	.69	.81	.69	.70	.70	.77	.83
Preferred time distribution	.25	.14	.00	.05	—.01	.16	—.11	—.06	.03	.10	—.02	.00
What is rewarded	.20	.14	.29	.34	.09	.10	.29	.29	.16	.22	.31	.32
What should be rewarded	.35	.26	—.13	—.22	.20	.10	.02	.16	.06	.03	—.06	—.12

TABLE 32
Professional and Scholarly Activities
Listed by Present and Former Teachers
(In Percentages)

Non-Teaching Activity	*Chemistry*		*English*			*Psychology*		*Total*	
	Pres.	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*		*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*
No. of Papers Read:									
0	30.0	16.0	41.4	45.6		16.0	22.0	28.8	27.4
1-5	35.4	52.0	52.7	41.2		47.4	56.0	41.1	47.3
6-9	8.0	12.0				10.0	16.0	9.5	9.6
10 or more	26.0	20.0	4.0	13.0		25.4	6.0	18.3	15.8
No reply	0.7	0.0	2.0	0.0		1.3	0.0	1.3	0.0
No. of Papers Published:									
0-2	36.7	16.0*	55.4	43.4		28.7	44.0	39 8	34.5
3-9	26.0	32.0	20.7	28.2		28.7	28.0	24.9	29.7
10 or more	37.4	52.0	24.0	26.0		42.7	28.0	34.3	35.9
No reply	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Books Published:									
Yes	22.0	12.0	26.7	32.6		23.4	26.0	23.8	23.5
No	78.0	88.0	73.4	67.3		76.7	74.0	75.2	77.3
Membership in Prof. Assoc.[1]									
National	53.4	60.0	59.4	36.9	APA	82.7	88.0		
State Assoc.	23.4	12.0	39.4	13.0	Reg. Assn.	52.0	46.0		
Other	44.7	88.0	23.4	15.2	State Assoc.	33.4	44.0		
Attendance at Meetings[1]									
National	61.4	58.0	63.4	17.4	National	60.7	62.0		
					Regional	39.4	30.0		
					State	50.0	42.0		
State and Other	58.0	46.0	44.0	49.9	Other	30.7	20.0		

[1] Because of checking of multiple responses the total is greater than 100 percent.

problems, It may be that these individuals had not yet formed any readiness to become "settled."

Table 33 contains three other items of interest. The first has to do with occupational identification. There was a question about this included in the questionnaire, but the staff quickly decided that it was totally unsatisfactory. Instead, it was felt that such identifications could be recognized when discussed in the interviews. This turned out to be the case. It is immediately apparent that almost no one identifies with the institution. A number said that they felt somewhat identified with it, but in almost every case, the primary identification was elsewhere, mostly with teaching or with the discipline.

There seems to be an interesting situation developing with respect to these identifications. More and more, the discipline, the professional society, claims the men's allegiance. They, in turn, dispense the significant rewards. That is, a young man who wishes to get ahead quickly in terms of rank and salary can, if he is intelligent about it, devote himself to becoming known among his colleagues across the nation. Specifically, he may publish, and he may attend meetings and serve on committees of the association. Having become known, he is then more likely than his stay-at-home colleague to receive job offers. These can either be accepted if they are good enough or be parlayed into rank and salary increments in his own institution. In

TABLE 33
Occupational Roles and Reactions of Present and Former Teachers
(From Interviews)

	Chemistry				*English*				*Psychology*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
	Pres. (N-4)	*For. (N-9)*	*Pres. (N-20)*	*For. (N-20)*	*Pres. (N-4)*	*For. (N-4)*	*Pres. (N-18)*	*For. (N-7)*	*Pres. (N-5)*	*For. (N-4)*	*Pres. (N-18)*	*For. (N-10)*
Identifies primarily with (percent):												
Teaching	50	78	50	50	0	25	50	42	60	25	17	40
Discipline	50	22	44	40	0	0	22	29	40	75	78	50
Institution	0	0	6	5	75	0	6	0	0	0	5	10
Other	0	0	0	5	25	75	22	29	0	0	0	0
Major likes (number mentioned):												
Colleagues	0	1	4	5	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0
Freedom	1	1	8	5	1	0	8	2	2	1	8	2
Research	0	0	7	4	2	0	6	1	0	0	9	2
Student	1	5	8	7	0	1	2	0	0	3	8	2
Teaching	3	6	11	15	3	1	13	5	2	2	10	8
Campus Life	1	1	1	4	0	2	3	1	1	1	0	1
Other	0	0	6	1	1	0	8	1	0	0	5	0
Major dislikes (number mentioned):												
Committees	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Administrative work	0	2	7	6	1	1	5	0	1	1	7	3
Teaching load	0	1	4	7	1	2	4	0	0	0	1	0
Teaching	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0
Salary	2	4	2	12	2	4	5	4	2	1	5	4
Facilities	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1
Students	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Research	1	4	1	5	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	1
Other	1	2	4	7	1	1	8	3	0	3	6	2

either case, the locus of critical decision about career advancement has to a large extent been taken out of the hands of (or been abdicated by) the college or university. In a situation of increasingly keen competition for faculty members, this is likely to increase rather than decrease as a practice. It almost places institutions of higher learning in the position of businesses which have to deal with numerous labor unions in order to hire workers.

Before this chapter on values and activities is closed, one other set of results needs to be presented. It has to do with the personality characteristics of present and former faculty members. As part of the questionnaires, a hundred personality inventory items (taken from the California Personality Inventory by Gough and a Ph.D. thesis, done under my direction by Dr. Alexander W. Astin) were included. As a first step, item analyses were performed to identify those items which differentiated significantly across the stay-leave criterion. Next, intercorrelations among these items were computed, and cluster analyses were made to identify groups of items that clung together. This process is roughly analogous to that of factor analysis; in most instances, the results are quite similar.

Five clusters were identified. One problem with factor or cluster analysis is the naming of the factors or clusters once they have been found. Trying to see through the items to the psychological processes underlying them is difficult and hazardous in the extreme. The names attached to these clusters are highly tentative. The reader is urged to read the items, consider the way they are scored, and try himself to see through to the process involved.

I. *Careful, cautious, yet able to tolerate ambiguity.*
   - I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized (Agree)*
   - I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place (Agree)
   - I do not like to see people carelessly dressed (Agree)
   - I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable (Agree)
   - I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same (Agree)
   - I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea of how it will turn out (Disagree)
   - I like work which keeps me busy all the time (Agree)
   - Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle (Agree)

II. *Philosophical, speculative.*
   - I like poetry (Agree)
   - I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as free will, evil, etc. (Agree)
   - The idea of doing research appeals to me (Agree)

III. *Positive social concern and interest.*
   - I find it easy to "drop" or "break with" a friend (Disagree)
   - The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans (Disagree)
   - A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself (Disagree)

IV. *Non-material values.*
   - I don't blame anyone for trying to get all he can in this world (Disagree)
   - Society owes a lot more to the businessman and the manufacturer than it does to the artist and the professor (Disagree)
   - Teachers often expect too much work from the students (Disagree)

V. *Satisfaction within the scholarly value systems.*
   - I would like a job which requires that I travel out of town frequently (Disagree)
   - I may take a job where the work itself is uninteresting to me but which provides me with considerable recognition and admiration from others (Disagree)
   - The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans (Disagree)
   - I don't blame anyone for trying to get all he can in the world (Disagree)
   - A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time (Disagree)
   - A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks out for himself (Disagree)
   - I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation (Disagree)

From these clusters, there emerges a picture of a hard-working, serious, sensitive, socially concerned individual whose value systems are clearly not those of the market place. In Thoreau's terms, he hears a different drummer and steps to the music that he hears.

---

*Indicates the direction of response of present teachers. In many cases, the former teachers' answers were in the same direction but (on a seven point scale) not as intense.

Chapter Six

Personnel Policies and Practices: the Conditions of Work

PERSONNEL POLICIES and practices should be fundamentally concerned with encouraging and assisting employees to perform their jobs well. Many, however, are concerned in addition with improving morale and job satisfaction. This is based on the assumption that high morale and job satisfaction also contribute to work effectiveness. Reduction of expensive turnover is another concern and will be an increasing one as obtaining replacements becomes more and more difficult. In this chapter, we shall consider the results of data analyses having to do with a variety of personnel policies and practices.

One concern is with fringe benefits. These are designed not so much to encourage directly the maximum in job performance as to do so indirectly through improving job satisfaction. Table 34 summarizes the questionnaire responses of present and former teachers with respect to the availability of fringe benefits. For the former teachers, the responses refer to the last academic position, not the present job.

Generally speaking, the situation for the chemists is that these fringe benefits are somewhat more available for present teachers. It is noteworthy, however, that there are several items that work in reverse; that is, the reported situation is better for former than for present teachers. For those in universities, the availability of sabbatical leaves, loans for housing, university housing, and expenses paid to meetings fall into this category. University housing is a tie, and the difference for expenses paid to meetings is small. There were no reversals and only one tie (availability of sabbatical leave) among the college teachers, present and former. For these, also, the differences between present and former teachers were, in general, larger than was true for the university teachers. Comparing the present university and college teachers, there is a general trend which suggests that fringe benefits are more available in colleges than in universities. In some cases, this is the result of a policy which substitutes such benefits for salaries.

For English teachers there were no reversals among the university teachers and only one (sabbatical leave) among the college teachers. Otherwise, the differences are in favor of the present teachers. Moreover, the differences between the present and former teachers are somewhat larger than for the chemists. The impression gained from the interviews was that such benefits are more important to those in English, mostly because they do not so often have available to them outside consulting opportunities as a means of earning more money. In addition, it is alleged by them that chemists receive higher salaries from the colleges and universities. This would fit with the facts in that competition from government and industry is keener for chemists.

Among the psychologists there were reversals in three cases with the former teachers reporting better situations. For the university teachers, reversals were in sabbatical leaves and reduced or free tuition for family members. For college teachers, the latter item also showed a small reversal.

These reversals should not be taken as justification for the elimination of such benefits. To put it another way, no causation should be attributed to these correlations (which, for these particular items, are negative with respect to the turn-over criterion). Over-all, present teachers report better fringe benefits situations than do former teachers. This suggests that, in general, they have a positive holding effect. The sabbatical leave probably works in reverse because, at least for the chemists and psychologists, they often spend these in government or industrial laboratories where research facilities and salaries are superior to those at the home institutions. Rather than eliminate the sabbatical leave, it would seem wise to improve the situation on the campus relative to the off-campus ones. The same might be said for expenses paid to meetings. Men who

TABLE 34
Comparison of Fringe Benefits Available to Present and Former Teachers[1]

	Chemistry				*English*				*Psychology*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
Benefit	*Pres.* %	*For.* %	*Pres.* %	*For.* %	*Pres.* %	*For.* %	*Pres.* %	*For.* %	*Pres.* %	*For.* %	*Pres.* %	*For.* %
a. Retirement security	100	57	96	66	91	71	97	61	93	85	97	62
b. Social security	98	29	82	28	89	48	98	46	100	31	87	32
c. Medical care plan	83	30	88	59	82	70	95	54	90	46	89	51
d. Sabbatical leave	33	33	31	45	27	33	48	42	36	31	32	37
e. Credit union	14	5	34	21	14	10	26	19	20	15	33	14
f. Loans for housing	18	10	3	10	20	0	9	4	18	8	19	11
g. University housing	38	14	24	24	36	5	47	21	28	14	30	22
h. Expenses paid to professional meetings	78	33	58	61	89	24	75	48	77	25	79	31
i. Tuition plan for family	52	24	26	21	41	35	25	22	32	39	31	40

[1] For former teachers, ratings are of the last academic job, not the present job.

attend meetings usually acquire a greater professional visibility which in turn makes them more likely to receive job offers from others. Keeping them at home by denying them expenses is not an answer. Again, it would be better to make the present position more attractive. Travel to meetings, moreover, is often a device used by those who are actively looking for other positions. One might question why the man's own institution should finance his search for another position. His reasons for wanting such a change are the real issue, however.

In Table 35 are the responses of the administrators with respect to fringe benefits. Combining the last two columns (available and available to a satisfactory degree) produces figures that agree in general with the responses of their faculty members. They are somewhat more optimistic (or realistic), but there do not appear to be any important differences. It is interesting that they agree much more with their faculties on fringe benefits than on reward values or job activities and preferences, both much more important matters.

TABLE 35
Available Fringe Benefits as Reported by Administrators

	College			*University*		
Benefits	*Not Avail.* %	*Avail.* %	*Satis.* %	*Not Avail.* %	*Avail.* %	*Satis.* %
Retirement	11	38	51	4	48	48
Social Security	6	40	55	4	46	50
Medical Care	5	49	46	4	42	54
Sabbatical Leave	71	19	10	54	27	19
Credit Union	85	9	7	72	16	12
Housing Loans	80	11	9	89	12	0
University Housing	55	29	16	46	50	4
Expenses paid to meetings	4	65	31	0	77	23
Tuition free or reduced for family	42	24	34	39	35	27
Other	85	9	7	69	15	15

Teaching load is one of the most important of the conditions of work. Table 36 summarizes the teaching loads and compares the differences between present and former teachers. There were several cases of significant differences. For the college teachers of English and psychology, the difference was significant and in the expected direction: former teachers reported higher loads. Among the university teachers, there were such differences for chemistry and English, again in the same direction. The difference for university teachers of psychology is in the same direction but is non-significant because of the different variability present. It will be remembered that, in the previous chapter, former teachers who, when describing the ideal teaching job, specified teaching also specified in many cases a lighter teaching load. It is also interesting to note the reversal (although the difference was not significant) in the case of present and former college teachers of chemistry. The present teachers report substantially higher teaching loads than do the former. It is difficult to understand why this reversal should have occurred.

TABLE 36
Teaching Loads Reported by Present and Former Teachers in Each Major Field

		Mean number of hours	
College			
1. Chemistry	—Present	16.27	
2. Chemistry	—Former	10.79	
3. English	—Present	13.02	*
4. English	—Former	15.24	
5. Psychology	—Present	8.25	*
6. Psychology	—Former	11.78	
University			
1. Chemistry	—Present	10.66	*
2. Chemistry	—Former	12.08	
3. English	—Present	10.66	*
4. English	—Former	12.16	
5. Psychology	—Present	12.61	
6. Psychology	—Former	14.27	

*Differences significant.

Table 37 summarizes the situation with respect to the availability of financial support for research. Quite interestingly, among the college teachers, the former teachers report substantially better situations than do the present teachers. Like some of the fringe benefits, this seems to work backwards. It should be noted, however, that, in general, only about a third reported such support. Among the university teachers, the reversal showed up in the case of the psychologists where the former teachers reported more support. In the case of the other two disciplines, the differences were in the expected direction.

TABLE 37
Percent of Present and Former Teachers in Each Field Reporting Available Financial Support for Research

	University		*College*	
Major field	*Present % yes*	*Former % yes*	*Present % yes*	*Former % yes*
Chemistry	37	28	21	29
English	41	36	25	38
Psychology	38	43	34	69

Table 38 describes the situation with respect to participation in the management of the department and the institution. With respect to participation in the department's management, Table 38 shows significant differences for all three disciplines in the case of university teachers. All are in the expected direction: less participation for former teachers. Although the levels of participation were about the same for the college teachers, the

TABLE 38
Extent of Participation in Decision Making

Group		*Participation in Departmental Decision Making (Mean)*[1]		*Participation in Institutional Decision Making (Mean)*[1]
College				
1. Chemistry	—Present	3.21		2.83
2. Chemistry	—Former	3.43		2.38
3. English	—Present	3.03		2.98
4. English	—Former	3.52		2.67
5. Psychology	—Present	3.90		3.00
6. Psychology	—Former	3.62		2.62
University				
1. Chemistry	—Present	3.87	*	2.64
2. Chemistry	—Former	3.38		2.52
3. English	—Present	3.59	*	2.62
4. English	—Former	2.96		2.22
5. Psychology	—Present	3.70	*	2.47
6. Psychology	—Former	3.14		2.46

[1] Ratings of extent of participation ranged from 1 (very little) to 5 (a great deal).
*Difference significant (.05 level of confidence).

differences were not significant between present and former teachers.

Participation in the management of the institution is a non-discriminating variable. In general, the level of participation in the affairs of the institution was considerably lower, as might be expected, than it was in the affairs of the department. In the interviews, many men reported caring very little about this, not being concerned as long as those things they wanted were available. I am reminded of the statement attributed to the late Gertrude Stein who said that as long as the garbage was collected and other services were provided, she didn't care who ran the government. College teachers seem in general to be somewhat more active in institutional management than are university professors.

A related question had to do with the administrative climates of the department and institution. These were varied along a scale from very democratic to very authoritarian. These climates turned out to be discriminating items with respect to the turn-over criterion. Table 39 shows these differences. Considering departmental administrative climate, four out of the six possible differences were significant. These differences are, moreover, in the predicted direction: better (more democratic) climates for present than for former teachers. The significant differences occurred in the cases of college teachers of English and psychology and university teachers of chemistry and English. The other two differences, while non-significant, were also in the predicted direction.

TABLE 39

Rating of Administrative Climate by Present and Former Teachers

Group		Rating of Department (Mean)[1]	Rating of Institution (Mean)[1]
College			
1. Chemistry .	—Present	4.06	3.47
2. Chemistry .	—Former	3.10 *	2.55 *
3. English . .	—Present	4.00	3.29
4. English . .	—Former	3.62	2.91
5. Psychology .	—Present	4.44	3.59
6. Psychology .	—Former	3.46 *	2.85 *
University			
1. Chemistry .	—Present	4.06	2.99
2. Chemistry .	—Former	3.07 *	2.76
3. English . .	—Present	3.80	3.01
4. English . .	—Former	2.92 *	2.36 *
5. Psychology .	—Present	3.44	2.82
6. Psychology .	—Former	3.22	2.86

[1] Ratings ranged from 1 (authoritarian) to 5 (democratic).

*Difference Significant.

While the differences in institutional climate were also in the predicted direction (more democratic climates for present teachers), only three were significant. These differences occurred in the cases of the college teachers of chemistry and psychology and the university teachers of English. It is also interesting to note, that, in general, institutional administrative climates were rated as somewhat more autocratic than departmental climates. This seems to be another case, possibly, of an effect of the communication gulf between the faculty and administration.

Several kinds of freedom were next considered. Table 40 summarizes the ratings. Although the over-all situation with respect to the freedom to select the courses taught was fairly good, three differences were significant between present and former teachers. All were in the predicted direction: more freedom for present teachers. These differences occurred in the cases of college teachers of chemistry and university teachers of chemistry and psychology. Other differences, although not significant, were also in the predicted direction.

By and large, the freedom to determine teaching schedule was less available than the freedom to select the courses taught. This appears to be especially true for the college teachers. However, only one difference between present and former college teachers was significant, that being for chemists. The other differences were, however, in the predicted direction. For the university teachers, however, all of the differences were in the predicted direction and were significant. Interviews brought to light reasons for this, the principal one having to do with trying to block out time for scholarship and research, activities of more concern in general to the university than to the college teachers.

By and large, most men reported considerable freedom to determine course content and teaching methods. All of the differences between present and former teachers are in the predicted direction and four are significant: college teachers of chemistry and psychology and university teachers of English and psychology. The psychologists in particular were sensitive to this matter since the content of their courses often runs afoul of community ideas. A number of psychologists reported having had pressures brought to bear on them to eliminate or soft pedal certain areas of discussion.

The freedom to determine out-of-class schedules ap-

TABLE 40

Rating of Several Aspects of Faculty Independence

	Chemistry				English				Psychology			
	College		University		College		University		College		University	
Area of Concern	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former	Present	Former
Independence to select courses to teach (mean)[1]	3.04	2.30*	3.46	2.90*	2.94	2.70	2.81	2.42	3.15	3.30	3.64	2.83*
Independence to arrange own teaching schedule (mean)	2.75	2.00*	2.93	2.36*	2.82	2.33	3.00	2.15*	2.65	2.23	3.64	2.43*
Independence to determine course content and methods (mean)	4.47	3.20*	4.15	3.79	3.40	3.29	4.16	3.19*	4.72	3.46	4.59	3.33*
Independence to set non-class schedule (mean)	4.02	3.35	4.11	3.62	4.11	3.62*	4.57	3.39*	4.21	3.54	3.96	3.81

[1] All means are based on a scale ranging from 1 (no or little freedom) to 5 (virtually complete freedom). Asterisks indicate a statistically significant difference between means for present and former teachers.

pears in general to be at a fairly good level. In only one case, the college teachers of English, was this item discriminating between present and former teachers although all of the differences were in the predicted direction. This freedom, poorly understood by neighbors, is of great importance to most teachers. Like artists, scholars and researchers, they cannot predict with accuracy when they will get ideas. Being forced to conform to a schedule seems, at least, to militate against their scholarly efforts.

Several other administrative policies and practices were investigated. In administrative attitudes toward consulting, no differences were large enough to be noteworthy, perhaps because in most cases the attitude is fairly permissive. (Data not shown.) Consulting, however, is a two-edged blade. Some administrators view it as a kind of substitute for better salaries. The faculty members, for the most part, are aware that such consulting detracts from other duties. They would, except where consulting provides them with access to interesting research, prefer to forego it—provided that salary adjustments are made. The experience at the University of Chicago may be a counter argument, but the feeling seems to be that, where consulting is just a device for augmenting the salary, it is not particularly desirable. Moreover, there were cases encountered in the interviews of individuals who proved to be so useful to industries or governmental agencies that they were hired at substantial salaries which were, however, less than the consulting rate.

Faculty members are frequently asked to do other things besides teach and do research. Questions were asked about compensation—either in reduced loads or in money—for these duties. Table 41 shows that, in general, the answer is "No!" Only administration seems to be rewarded to any appreciable extent. By and large, the situation is better in this regard for university than for college teachers. In almost every case, there were fairly substantial differences between present and former teachers, these differences being in the predicted direction: more rewards for present teachers. This is an area which creates a considerable amount of resentment among faculty members. A common attitude seems to be that administrators are paid for being administrators and should not ask faculty members to do their jobs for them. Correct and reasonable or not, it is pervasive and powerful.

Tables 42 and 43 are based on interview responses related to the matter of conditions of work. These responses are evaluative rather than descriptive like those in previous tables. Teaching load, for instance, shows some interesting differences between present and former

TABLE 42
Rating of Work Conditions by Present Teachers
(From interviews)

Working Conditions Present Teachers	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*	
	College (N-4)	*Univ.* (N-18)	*College* (N-4)	*Univ.* (N-18)	*College* (N-5)	*Univ.* (N-18)
Teaching load and other responsibilities (percent)						
A. Teaching load						
1. All right	50.0	67.2	25.0	44.8	40.0	50.4
2. Too heavy	50.0	33.6	75.0	56.0	60.0	50.4
B. Other responsibilities						
1. All right	50.0	50.4	25.0	72.8	40.0	56.0
2. Too heavy	50.0	50.4	75.0	28.0	60.0	44.8
Research facilities and support (percent)						
A. Research facilities						
1. All right	50.0	67.2	50.0	61.6	40.0	56.0
2. Inadequate	50.0	33.6	50.0	39.2	60.0	44.8
B. Support (institute)						
1. All right	50.0	28.0	50.0	61.6	40.0	39.2
2. Inadequate	50.0	72.8	50.0	39.2	60.0	61.6
Participation in the administration of: (mean)						
A. Department	3.5	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.1
B. Institution	1.5	2.3	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.4
Communication (mean)						
A. Upward	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.1	3.2	2.8
B. Downward	3.0	2.9	3.5	3.1	2.8	2.9

TABLE 43
Rating of Work Conditions by Former Teachers
(From interviews)

Working Conditions Former Teachers	*Chemistry*		*English*		*Psychology*	
	College (N-9)	*Univ.* (N-20)	*College* (N-4)	*Univ.* (N-7)	*College* (N-4)	*Univ.* (N-10)
Teaching load and other responsibilities (percent)						
A. Teaching load						
1. All right	22.2	40.0	100.0	42.9	75.0	50.0
2. Too heavy	77.7	60.0	0.0	57.2	25.0	50.0
B. Other responsibilities						
1. All right	22.2	45.0	100.0	42.9	75.0	60.0
2. Too heavy	77.7	55.0	0.0	57.2	25.0	40.0
Research facilities and support (percent)						
A. Research facilities						
1. All right	11.1	40.0	25.0	42.9	0.0	30.0
2. Inadequate	88.8	60.0	75.0	57.2	100.0	70.0
B. Support (Institute)						
1. All right	11.1	20.0	25.0	28.6	0.0	30.0
2. Inadequate	88.8	80.0	75.0	71.5	100.0	70.0
Participation in the administration of: (mean)						
A. Department	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.4
B. Institute	2.2	2.7	2.3	3.3	2.3	2.9
Communication (mean)						
A. Upward	3.2	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.9
B. Downward	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.7	2.7

TABLE 41
Extent to Which Work Adjustments Are Made for Certain Special Duties[1]
(Percent reporting such adjustments)

Activity	*Chemistry*				*English*				*Psychology*			
	College		*University*		*College*		*University*		*College*		*University*	
	Pres.	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*	*Pres.*	*For.*
Advising undergraduates	8	0	15	7	5	0	6	11	15	0	13	11
Advising graduates	0	5	14	10	0	0	7	7	3	0	20	5
Directing theses	4	5	47	31	5	0	21	11	8	0	34	14
Research	13	0	40	28	6	0	26	7	15	8	38	11
Counseling	8	5	9	7	8	5	5	4	21	23	13	16
Committee work	6	0	6	7	11	0	5	0	5	0	11	0
Administration	18	9	30	14	33	10	49	11	33	8	43	8
Advising student clubs	2	5	2	4	6	0	2	0	0	0	1	0

[1] For Former Teachers, response refers to their last teaching job, not their present job.

teachers. For the chemists, the differences are in the predicted direction and quite large. In English, however, the difference for college teachers is a reversal (former teachers more satisfied with teaching load) and university teachers yield essentially no differences. The same is true in psychology: former teachers seem to feel that their teaching loads were all right. Something of the same pattern may be seen in the case of the second question having to do with other duties. This may, as has been mentioned before, represent some memory distortion or the operation of the old oaken bucket illusion. Teaching loads, measured by hours per week, did differentiate significantly between present and former teachers. Yet here, the *reactions* to such loads show some interesting reversals.

The availability of research facilities shows differences almost entirely in the predicted direction: a better situation for present teachers. The same holds for institutional support of research. This item is somewhat difficult to interpret, however, because so much support of research, even where apparently from the institution, is really from other sources. Many of those interviewed, particularly those in chemistry and psychology, made the point that virtually all research support had to be obtained from outside sources, sources which often have special interests that limit the freedom to select research topics.

Participation in the administrative affairs of the department and institution showed some interesting trends. Departmental participation showed very slight differences between present and former teachers, and some of these were contrary to the predictions made. That is, former teachers, especially in English, reported having participated more than present teachers.

With respect to participation in the administration of the institution, the total level (as was true from questionnaire responses) was somewhat lower, and there was no consistent pattern of differences between the present and former teachers. While questionnaire responses to this item yielded no significant differences, the differences were in the predicted direction. Not so with the interview responses.

Much the same sort of situation occurred with respect to communication. Generally, downward communication is rated poorer by all groups. Differences between present and former teachers are not large, and the pattern is not consistent. The mean values indicate quite clearly in both upward and downward communication that substantial room exists for improvement. This inadequate communication system seems to underlie a number of difficulties, particularly the lack of understanding of each group, faculty and administration, of one another's motives, desires, and problems.

This is clearly demonstrated in Table 44 which contains administrators' ratings on a number of these same variables. The question dealing with an allowance for non-teaching duties shows, first of all, a general agreement that such allowance is not made. This agrees with faculty reactions. Interestingly, administrators concede that administrative tasks are the most frequently rewarded, thus agreeing with faculty perceptions. The situation with respect to the difference between colleges and universities suggests that universities make these allowances more frequently and adequately than do colleges.

TABLE 44
Rating of Work Conditions by Administrators

	College			*University*		
Teaching load (mean no. hrs.)		14.3			13.0	
	None	*Some*	*Adequate*	*None*	*Some*	*Adequate*
Allowance for non-teaching duties: (percent)						
Advising undergraduates	85	11	4	69	23	8
Advising graduates	96	3	1	69	31	0
Directing theses	82	9	9	46	35	19
Research	74	23	3	39	39	23
Counseling	81	13	6	73	15	12
Committee work	89	10	1	96	4	0
Administrative	58	41	1	12	58	31
Advising study clubs	92	7	1	100	0	0
Does institution provide research funds? (percent)						
Yes		28			73	
No		72			27	
Do these compare favorably with other institutions? (percent)						
Yes		46			42	
No		14			37	
Uncertain		41			21	
Is travel to professional meetings paid for? (percent)						
Yes		94			100	
No		6			0	
All expenses paid? (percent)						
Yes		34			21	
No		66			79	
For: (percent)						
All faculty		60			54	
Some		40			46	

Administrative perceptions of the provision of research funds seem slightly more optimistic than the faculties'. On the other hand, administrators are likely to be in a better position to know what is available. Perhaps the discrepancy rests on a difference of opinion about what constitutes adequate support. It is interesting to note the relatively great uncertainty on this item. Information on competing salaries is much more likely to be known.

Administrators also have a somewhat better view of the travel paid to meetings. Again, since they have to approve such requests and find the funds, they usually know the facts. At the same time, the difference between them and the faculty on this suggests that availability must be considered on several levels.

Finally, Table 45 describes administrative responses to certain other conditions of work items. College adminis-

TABLE 45
Institutional Policies Affecting Faculty
Members as Reported by Administrators

	College	*University*
Policy toward outside consulting (mean)	2.9[1]	4.1
Extent to which faculty may: (mean)		
A. Select own courses	3.2	3.4
B. Determine hours at which courses taught	3.0	3.5
C. Determine course content and methods	4.4	4.0
D. Set campus hours (except classes)	4.2	4.5
How effective is the communication system?		
A. Downward	3.9	3.2
B. Upward	3.8	3.3

[1] Means are based on scales ranging from 1 (poor situation) to 5 (good situation). Thus, the first item shows that universities are somewhat more permissive about consulting than are colleges.

trators seem to be less favorable toward consulting than their faculties believe and, apparently, behave. By and large, they believe that they have more freedom than the faculty does although the difference is not great.

With respect to the effectiveness of upward and downward communication, they are considerably more impressed by it than are their faculties. Of course, administrators have many upward channels and tend to hear, sooner or later, about many things which do not go through the official upward channels. Being principally in control of the downward channels, their confidence in them is understandable, if over-optimistic.

Chapter Seven

Miscellaneous Matters

WIDESPREAD COMPLAINTS about the status of college teaching as an occupation have, it is frequently alleged, hindered efforts to recruit young men and women into the profession. There are two aspects to this problem: (1) the actual facts of the situation—is the status or prestige of teaching declining?—and, (2) perceptions of the status of teaching. Periodically, there have been studies of the prestige rankings of various occupations. Typically, these have shown the occupation college professor to be near the top, following closely after medicine. The perceptions of present and former college teachers, however, are something else.

Table 46 contains the questionnaire responses related to the status of teaching. The large majority of respondents appear to believe that the status of teaching is declining.

TABLE 46
Teachers' Perceptions of the Status of Their Profession

Groups	*Increasing* %	*Remaining same* %	*Decreasing* %
College			
Chemistry—Present teachers	12	23	65
Chemistry—Former teachers	0	40	60
English—Present teachers	14	27	59
English—Former teachers	5	24	71
Psychology—Present teachers	8	38	55
Psychology—Former teachers	0	31	69
University			
Chemistry—Present teachers	11	20	69
Chemistry—Former teachers	3	14	83
English—Present teachers	10	26	63
English—Former teachers	11	14	75
Psychology—Present teachers	9	26	66
Psychology—Former teachers	11	5	84

By and large, former teachers' ratings indicate that they, more than present teachers, feel this decline. The timing of this research was, in a sense, unfortunate as far as this variable is concerned. Between the time when the data collection instruments were developed and the data collection actually began, the appearance of Sputnik I radically altered the climate of opinion about research and scholarship, particularly in the sciences.

One effect of this change may be seen in the comparison of the questionnaire and interview responses with respect to status. Tables 47 and 48 summarize these interview responses. The status of college teaching would appear to be higher (or, at least, suffering less decline) from the interviews than from the questionnaires. However, in the interviews, many faculty members, present and former, qualified their ratings by saying that Sputnik I altered a general downward trend, either halting it or reversing it—at least temporarily. This last qualification—a temporary awareness of the importance of learning—was very common and seemed to represent a widely felt opinion that, by and large, the public neither understands nor appreciates learning.

TABLE 47
Variables Affecting Present Teachers'
Plans to Stay in Teaching
(From interviews)

Variable	*Chemistry* *College* *(N-4)*	*Chemistry* *Univ.* *(N-18)*	*English* *College* *(N-4)*	*English* *Univ.* *(N-18)*	*Psychology* *College* *(N-5)*	*Psychology* *Univ.* *(N-18)*
Status of college teaching: (percent)						
No change	50.0	33.6	0.0	16.8	60.0	28.0
Increasing	25.0	33.6	0.0	11.2	0.0	5.6
Declining	25.0	33.6	100.0	72.8	40.0	67.2
Status of: (mean)						
Department	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.6
Institution	2.8	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.2	3.1
Plan to remain in teaching: (percent)						
Yes	75.0	95.2	100.0	89.6	80.0	72.8
No	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	20.0	5.6
Uncertain	25.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	0.0	22.4

TABLE 48
Variables Affecting Former Teachers'
Decision About Teaching
(From interviews)

Variable	*Chemistry* *College* *(N-9)*	*Chemistry* *Univ.* *(N-20)*	*English* *College* *(N-4)*	*English* *Univ.* *(N-7)*	*Psychology* *College* *(N-4)*	*Psychology* *Univ.* *(N-10)*
Status of college teaching: (percent)						
No change	22.3	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	20.0
Increasing	0.0	5.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Declining	77.7	70.0	25.0	100.0	25.0	80.0
Status of: (mean)						
Department	2.6	3.6	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.3
Institution	2.4	2.9	2.3	2.9	2.0	2.7
Plan to return to teaching: (percent)						
Yes	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
No	88.8	40.0	75.0	100.0	50.0	80.0
Like to	0.0	30.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	10.0
Uncertain	11.2	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0

Underlying this perception of the status of teaching, however, is what appears to be a widespread misconception among college teachers. Quite frequently, the status of teachers in America was compared with the status in Europe, especially in Germany, where the Herr Professor carries tremendous prestige. At the same time, few teachers appeared to be aware of the differences in the organization of higher education here and in Germany. In America, departments may have, depending on their size, one, two, or a dozen full professors. In Germany, it is usually the case that each department has but one professor. This fact alone would seem to account for some of the prestige of the professor; here, he is a commoner article.

Nevertheless, the facts to the contrary notwithstanding, the feelings of America's college teachers that their work is not valued or appreciated constitutes a serious problem. A number of former teachers said that their decisions to leave teaching were based in part on such feelings. Having such feelings as widespread as they are cannot help and almost certainly hurts recruitment efforts. It is quite likely that this feeling of not being appreciated is a symptom, based on some of the difficulties outlined in chapters 5 and 6 of a generally poor morale. Even so, it is a serious symptom, and its causes should be identified and dealt with immediately.

In addition to the over-all status of teaching, we were interested in other dimensions of status, particularly the status of the department and the institution. With respect to the department, it may be seen that present teachers feel that the status of their departments is higher than do the former teachers. The same difference may be seen with respect to the status of the institution. A particularly interesting difference may be seen by comparing mean ratings of the status of the department and the institution. Uniformly, the department is seen as having higher status than the institution. A common response to this question was, "The department is pretty good, much better than the college (or university)."

In this study, departmental and institutional status did not, so far as could be told, operate in the manner described by Caplow and McGee (*op; cit.*). They describe a movement based on the attraction of the high prestige of the department and institution. Their sample, however, consisted of ten of the highest prestige institutions in the country. Only two of those institutions were included in this study. In this study, on the other hand, institutions and departments representing the entire range of prestige were studied. In agreement with Caplow and McGee, no one seemed anxious or even willing to move down the prestige hierarchy, but upward movement did not seem to be a major attraction. Salary and other conditions of work seemed to be much more important than prestige. Administrators are, if anything, much more pessimistic about the status of college teaching than professors are. Virtually all of them see the status of college teaching as in serious decline. Whether they are reacting to faculty perceptions or the reverse cannot be determined, but some interaction is almost certainly operating.

On the other hand, they are considerably more impressed with the prestige of the institution than are their faculty members. This is understandable; it is also possible that their estimates are more realistic since they typically have more opportunities to know how other institutions operate. The discrepancy between their ratings and the ratings of their faculty members constitutes another example of a perceptual difference that may lie at the root of many difficulties.

The plans of present and former teachers are shown in Table 49. Most present teachers plan to remain in teaching. However, the approximately fifteen or twenty per cent who are either uncertain or definitely planning to leave are a large enough group to cause concern. Comparatively few former teachers are actually planning to return to teaching. A fairly large number, however, would like to. In evaluating these responses in the interviews, an attempt was made to sort out the idle wishes from those with some reality behind them. Most of those who said they would like to return qualified this with a set of conditions, usually including a better salary, improved research facilities, and a lighter teaching load.

The average turnover rates in these institutions show a slight upward movement during the past five years. This turnover includes those leaving for other academic positions as well as those leaving teaching altogether. Whether these curves will accelerate in the future as competition increases is an interesting question.

Average salaries by rank in these institutions are considerably higher in the universities than in the colleges. This suggests that the colleges are going to have an extremely difficult time in attracting young Ph.D.'s to replace the ones lost through retirement, death, or to other competing institutions. In spite of the competition, most administrators still hope to get doctorate holders at the upper levels of the academic ladder.

Tables 50 through 52 have to do with plans, goals, and goal attainment of present and former teachers. Table 50 agrees, in general, with the data presented earlier. Most college teachers plan to remain in teaching. However,

TABLE 49
Career Plans of Present and Former Teachers

	Plan to Remain in Non-teaching			*Plan to Remain in Present Job*			*Would Like to Return to Teaching*		
Groups	*Yes* %	*?* %	*No* %	*Yes* %	*?* %	*No* %	*Yes* %	*?* %	*No* %
Former Teachers									
College									
Chemistry	59	41	0	57	33	10	57	19	24
English	62	29	9	50	35	15	48	19	33
Psychology	69	23	8	69	31	0	46	15	39
University									
Chemistry	59	38	3	44	44	12	46	39	15
English	59	37	4	48	48	4	41	26	33
Psychology	59	35	6	62	30	8	54	22	24
*Present Teachers**									
College									
Chemistry	79	19	2	54	34	12	Not Applicable		
English	96	2	2	37	47	16	Not Applicable		
Psychology	90	10	0	39	33	28	Not Applicable		
University									
Chemistry	78	21	1	58	34	8	Not Applicable		
English	93	7	0	46	40	16	Not Applicable		
Psychology	80	20	0	40	46	14	Not Applicable		

* Read heading of first three columns *"Plan to Remain in Teaching."*

TABLE 50

Occupational Goals of College and University Teachers

Groups	Professor %	Research Professor %	Department Chairman %	Dean %	President %
College					
Chemistry Present	42	22	30	6	0
Chemistry Former	24	35	29	6	6
English Present	56	8	25	5	6
English Former	58	8	21	8	4
Psychology Present	31	10	35	19	4
Psychology Former	30	20	30	10	10
University					
Chemistry Present	46	32	13	9	1
Chemistry Former	38	38	14	7	4
English Present	67	20	5	6	2
English Former	72	16	4	0	8
Psychology Present	51	35	7	6	1
Psychology Former	35	24	19	16	5

TABLE 51

Goal Attainment of College and University Teachers

Groups	A[1]			B			C		
	Yes %	No %	? %	Yes %	No %	? %	Yes %	No %	? %
College									
Chemistry Present	37	55	9	37	29	34	44	15	41
Chemistry Former	20	80	0	29	71	0	62	38	0
English Present	26	66	8	44	25	31	44	8	48
English Former	21	79	0	41	59	0	75	25	0
Psychology Present	48	45	7	39	35	26	63	7	30
Psychology Former	10	90	0	44	56	0	63	37	0
University									
Chemistry Present	33	57	9	56	25	19	63	9	28
Chemistry Former	14	86	0	48	52	0	82	14	4
English Present	41	31	28	53	10	37	71	6	23
English Former	11	85	4	16	84	0	64	32	4
Psychology Present	29	66	5	47	30	23	69	5	26
Psychology Former	19	81	0	18	82	0	75	25	0

[1] The three categories are as follows:
A. have you attained your goal?
B. if not, do you have a reasonably good chance of attaining it in your present institution? or,
C. in some other institution,

TABLE 52

Goals of Former Teachers

Former Position	Current Goals		Goal Attainment					
	Would Prefer Academic	Plan to Remain in Non-Academic	Already Attained		Expect in Present Employment		Expect in Other Non-Teaching Job	
			Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
College								
Chemistry	0	100	42	58	87	13	90	10
English	35	65	18	82	82	18	77	23
Psychology	10	90	40	60	89	11	67	33
University								
Chemistry	18	82	52	48	86	14	80	20
English	33	67	35	65	75	25	64	36
Psychology	19	81	26	74	57	43	63	37

the uncertain group is large enough to cause concern. The percentages planning to move to another institution, however, are fairly large, constituting nearly half of the sample. College teachers have always been a mobile group. Their failure to identify with an institution, reported earlier, is another instance of this. However, it will also be recalled that one characteristic of the former teachers is a pattern of frequent job changes. Having searched in a number of collegiate settings for whatever was important to them, they then transferred their search to non-academic settings. It is true that some of this represents a malaise, in some cases a conflict-based, irrational searching. It is also true that a certain amount of this mobility is probably natural and desirable. Colleges and universities have a social and intellectual climate that favors certain individuals both as students and teachers. Some men have to move several times before they find that setting in which they can be comfortable. Some will never find such a place, either because it does not exist or because their own characteristics will not permit them to put down roots. To one who has spent a considerable amount of time in vocational counseling, this situation is one which seems to be a fertile but so far untouched field of work.

Table 50 reports responses concerned with occupational goals. The response categories are as follows: (A) Professor; (B) Research Professor; (C) Department Chairman; (D) Dean; (E) President. It is quite apparent that dean and president are not common goals. Professor is the most common goal. Among university professors, research professor is next, followed by department chairman. For the college teachers, the chairmanship precedes research professor, perhaps because few colleges have research professorships available. There is no clearly detectable pattern of differences between present and former teachers. A fairly frequent comment in the interviews was the complaint that it is too bad that, to attain a decent salary, a man has to get involved in administration.

Table 51 reports on the feelings of goal attainment of the present teachers. The response conditions are as follows: (A) have attained goal; (B) expect to attain it in present institution; (C) expect to attain goal in another institution. Considering condition A first, it is apparent that differences between present and former teachers exist. For the former teachers, these responses had to do with the last academic positions. Otherwise, it is interesting to note that only about a third of the present teachers expect to attain their goals in the present institution, a fact that relates to the data in Table 51.

Condition B describes the extent to which these men expect to attain their goals in another institution. The same pattern of differences between present and former teachers exists. Approximately half of the present teachers expect to be able to attain their goals where they are. This can be looked on as a reassuring statistic or a troublesome one. It may be seen (condition C), however, that about the same proportion expect to attain their goals in another institution. Since B and C are related, this finding is to be expected.

Table 52 deals with the goals and goal attainment of the former teachers. Considering first of all their plans most of them plan to remain out of teaching. A fairly large proportion, however, are uncertain, a fact of interest in view of present shortages. Approximately half plan to remain in their present jobs, a figure that is reminiscent of the one for present teachers. The last column which asks whether they would like to return to teaching should be compared with Table 48 which analyzes the interview responses to this item. The questionnaires give a somewhat inflated picture. It will be recalled that, in analyzing the questionnaire responses, an attempt was made to sort out those whose wish to return to teaching was largely at the fantasy level, to identify those whose wishes appeared to have some real strength in them. Both groups appear to be included in the responses in this table. What it would take to get these individuals to return would be interesting to determine. Several mentioned that they would be willing to take a salary cut, but going from $12,000 to $10,000 still limits the number of institutions that could hire them.

It is apparent that the vast majority of former teachers do not aspire to a teaching post (except, perhaps, under impossibly ideal conditions). It is interesting to note that the former teachers of English who are, as was noted earlier, much more academic men, more frequently wish to return to teaching. However, only about a third of them are in this group. Considering these tables, it seems likely that once a man is lost from teaching, the chances of his returning are slight. This is despite the fact that, having jumped the fence, many former teachers find the grass little or no greener. They are not, in many cases, especially happy where they are but are likely to remain nevertheless.

Table 52 also describes the goal attainments of former teachers. Not many more have attained their goals than their colleagues in teaching. However, a very large percentage expect to attain their goals in their present employment, a different situation from that of the present teachers. The last column, which agrees closely with the interview responses, shows that the vast majority expect to remain outside of teaching. This difference between expectations and wishes is interesting to contemplate.

Three or four matters remain to be considered. These are summarized in Tables 53 through 56. One question which was asked had to do with whether the man had had any formal training for teaching. There is considerable feeling that such training would be a good thing for college teachers who typically enter the classroom armed with technical expertness in the subject field but no preparation for teaching. More college teachers have had such training than is true for the university teachers.

TABLE 53
Formal Training for Teaching

Groups	Had Such Training Yes %	Had Such Training No %	Would Like to Have Had Yes %	Would Like to Have Had No %
College				
Chemistry Present	41	59	19	81
Chemistry Former	57	43	0	100
English Present	68	32	0	100
English Former	42	58	18	82
Psychology Present	68	32	0	100
Psychology Former	69	31	50	50
University				
Chemistry Present	27	73	17	83
Chemistry Former	24	76	0	100
English Present	37	63	14	86
English Former	42	58	40	60
Psychology Present	45	55	25	75
Psychology Former	57	43	38	62

Colleges more often concern themselves, when hiring, with teaching competence and interest whereas the universities tend to be more concerned with research competence. There is no discernible pattern of differences between present and former teachers on this item. The other related question about whether the men would like to have had such training yielded some interesting results. By and large, they would not. Training for teaching is, in most cases, equated with courses in education. Education is looked on as an unwelcome, intellectually inferior interloper in higher education. This is another case where the actual facts are less important than the attitudes. It is the popular thing to deride education. Such popularity is not entirely unmerited. It is quite likely that training for teaching, if it is to be done at the college level, may have to be divorced from the departments or colleges of education.

It was noted earlier that most of the men in this study were born in the Southern region and reared there. It was also shown that place of birth was to a certain extent associated with the decision to leave. It is therefore interesting to consider Table 54 where responses to a question about area of the country in which they would like to work are presented. The Southern region is the most preferred, but the preferences are sufficiently scattered—particularly including the middle Atlantic, southwest, and far western regions—that, if such geographical preferences have much force, the Southern region could be in for troubles.

Finally Tables 55 and 56 report on the formal and informal job offers received and their sources. What constitutes a job offer is by no means an easy thing to decide. Often a casual inquiry may really be one if any encouragement is given. Conversely, there are occasions when fairly formal letters have less real meaning. In this study, an informal offer was defined for the subjects as follows: "By informal is meant any inquiry which you feel might have

TABLE 54
Geographical Preferences

Groups	N. E. %	Middle Atlan. %	South East %	South West %	Middle West %	Plains %	Rockies %	West Coast %
College								
Chemistry Present	4	15	31	23	13	0	4	10
Chemistry Former	10	20	30	10	10	0	10	10
English Present	9	14	44	15	8	0	2	9
English Former	30	26	15	4	7	7	4	7
Psychology Present	12	14	35	21	5	0	2	12
Psychology Former	0	7	50	14	7	0	0	21
University								
Chemistry Present	2	10	37	19	14	0	5	12
Chemistry Former	16	19	16	16	3	3	3	23
English Present	19	26	30	9	3	0	0	12
English Former	21	21	15	15	3	3	3	21
Psychology Present	8	12	22	16	10	1	3	30
Psychology Former	10	13	20	28	5	0	5	20

TABLE 55
Formal Job Offers Received in Previous Year by Source

	Colleges and Universities				Government or Industry				Others			
Groups	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 or more %	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 or more %	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 or more %
College												
Chemistry Present	67	16	14	4	86	10	0	4	98	0	0	2
Chemistry Former	87	7	7	0	90	0	0	10	100	0	0	0
English Present	64	14	14	8	97	3	0	0	96	4	0	0
English Former	80	20	0	0	86	10	0	4	90	5	5	0
Psychology Present	78	5	13	5	80	15	5	0	92	3	3	3
Psychology Former	85	15	0	0	62	8	23	8	100	0	0	0
University												
Chemistry Present	77	8	10	5	88	5	5	2	98	2	0	0
Chemistry Former	97	0	3	0	83	4	4	10	97	0	3	0
English Present	57	20	11	12	94	4	1	1	94	4	2	0
English Former	82	7	4	7	79	11	4	7	89	11	0	0
Psychology Present	62	22	8	9	74	18	8	1	92	5	2	2
Psychology Former	71	8	11	11	51	22	14	14	86	3	8	3

resulted in a definite offer if pursued further by you." Table 55 describes the number and sources of formal offers received. Considering the sources, it is first apparent that more offers are coming from colleges and universities than from other sources. By and large, the former teachers are receiving more offers from colleges and universities than are present teachers, although the differences are not great. University teachers report slightly fewer offers than the college teachers, both from other colleges and universities and from government and industry. This may suggest that the colleges, more than the universities, are regarded as the better hunting grounds. They may be.

Table 56 reports on the informal job offers. As might be expected, there were more of these reported. The same trends appear here as in Table 55 except in magnification. The relatively large number of informal offers from government and industry are particularly interesting. A dissatisfied faculty member, with such an informal offer in his pocket, is a potentially tricky problem. To what extent these informal offers have been solicited it is impossible to say. Certainly, there is a fair amount of window shopping that goes on. However, if it will be recalled that about twenty per cent of the college teachers are uncertain about remaining in teaching, the fishermen from government and industry are bound to have some success. Some they should undoubtedly have, because there are people in teaching who should not be. On the other hand, they are often looking for very much the same sort of individual whom the colleges and universities most wish to keep. A critical part of the question, of course, is concerned with what the anglers from higher education are using as bait to compete with the ones from industry and government. If they are using just money, they are almost certain to lose. If, however, they will recognize that college teachers have a motivational structure (see Chapters 4 and 5) which predisposes them to enter and remain in teaching where they can find certain things of great importance that are not available elsewhere, recruitment into higher education may be able to compete with other efforts successfully.

TABLE 56
Informal Job Offers Received in Previous Year by Source

	Colleges and Universities				Government or Industry				Others			
Groups	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 or more %	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 or more %	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 or more %
College												
Chemistry Present	50	14	22	14	83	10	4	4	91	8	0	1
Chemistry Former	80	10	5	5	50	9	14	27	90	0	0	10
English Present	53	11	18	18	94	4	2	0	97	2	2	0
English Former	62	14	10	14	62	0	19	19	90	0	5	5
Psychology Present	43	25	20	13	75	20	3	3	88	7	0	5
Psychology Former	46	0	23	31	46	15	23	15	85	0	8	8
University												
Chemistry Present	57	18	17	8	51	25	11	13	97	0	2	1
Chemistry Former	82	11	7	0	57	14	18	11	100	0	0	0
English Present	72	13	4	12	88	7	3	3	99	1	0	0
English Former	62	10	7	21	79	11	0	11	95	5	0	0
Psychology Present	43	21	21	15	51	28	14	7	91	6	1	3
Psychology Former	46	8	27	19	55	11	11	24	92	3	3	3

Chapter Eight

Some Implications for Action

THE MAJOR FINDINGS of this study have been summarized in the first chapter, organized around the two major questions of this study: Why people become teachers, and why some people leave teaching. The major purpose of this study was to add to our knowledge about these questions, and the application of this information in the improvement of personnel recruitment and retention is the responsibility of the college and university administrators and faculty members who read this report.

Out of the many possible implications in the report, a few seem worthy of special comment and are discussed below.

First, much more research is needed. All research reports arrive at this conclusion. Yet, trite as it may be, it is true. This study was limited to three disciplines, reports only on men, and deals only with one region of the country. Comparing notes with other investigators, it seemed that these results have some considerable communality, but there are also regional and other effects.

Some of the relationships are only correlational, leaving unspecified the real, underlying variables. For instance, men whose wives were born in the South were more likely to stay in teaching than were men whose wives were born elsewhere. It would seem unwise to concentrate our efforts on getting teachers married to Southern girls, whatever virtues and attractions they may have. But we should find out why this correlation exists, what lies behind it.

Besides finding out things that need to be known, research has another value. This is related to the well-known Hawthorne effect. Sometimes the mere act of girding up one's loins to study something produces an excitement, a ferment, and a re-examination of presuppositions that is valuable no matter what else happens. The willingness to question what one does is probably a healthy attitude. It is one which research fosters.

Secondly, we should turn some attention to the drift which brings most teachers to teaching. It was noted earlier that this drift may be more apparent than real, but it is also quite likely that, by our casual attitude toward recruiting our successors, we are losing many promising potential teachers. Improved guidance is one obvious possibility. Some problems are raised here, however, because we do not know very much about the rates of development of the traits that culminate in becoming a teacher. Until we do, guidance counselors will have to work to a considerable extent in the dark.

We need, also, to effect changes in the image of college teaching as a career and college teachers as people. Too long, we have permitted and even encouraged, through a kind of perverse logic, the perpetuation of stereotypes not likely to be useful in attracting young people to teaching. The absentminded professor, dowdy and disheveled, his mind in the clouds, disporting himself with dangerously subversive or, at best, useless ideas is an image that is not true and is not, outside Mr. Chips-ish novels, appealing.

Some of the image changes will come about only when certain other changes are made. Some professors are indeed dowdy and tattered. Better salaries would help alleviate this in most cases since, while few are fascinated by the latest Brooks Brothers' efforts, most are glad to be able to dress reasonably well (remember, if you will, the middle class backgrounds from which they come).

Even so, our society must somehow learn that a man is not measured by the size of his bank account. This is a difficult but not impossible task. After all, if Athenian soldiers could sense that Socrates, standing stock still for a day and a night, lost in thought, might be doing something worthwhile, might be building some resources of real power, it is not impossible to expect that twentieth century man might learn as much. How this might be done is difficult to specify.

If, as is likely, we will not have enough good college teachers, we should do what we can to attract and retain them and, perhaps more important, utilize their talents better. College teachers are caught in a dilemma. They are rewarded for doing such things as research, but they spend most of their time teaching. Being bright, most learn quickly that they had better do what pays off. But most do this with reluctance, because they value good teaching and know it takes time.

There is a running argument going on which seems, on analysis, to be improper. Research and scholarship are opposed, in this argument, to teaching. Sometimes, equally bad, they are equated. Few seem to realize that individual characteristics must be considered. Universities, if they are to retain their position as primary sources of new ideas, must support some men whose forte is research even though they may not be good teachers. Perhaps they should not be asked to teach at all. Colleges and the instructional parts of universities must recruit and support good teaching. As matters now stand, teaching is required but research is rewarded.

Roles and functions must be analyzed and better understood. Too many presidents and deans live with an unnecessary feeling of inferiority and rejection. They are, to many faculty members, necessary nuisances. With such feelings, it is small wonder that their attempts to do what they see ought to be done are halfhearted and diffident. It is true that, in the great European universities, the faculty rules the roost, that administrators are elected by the faculty for brief periods. It is also true that, while American universities derive heavily from European, they have, in adapting to the special problems of America, developed characteristics that make necessary quite different organizational patterns.

Administrators and faculty members need to re-examine the faculty roles. Uncertainty prompts teachers to undertake administrative duties which in many cases they do not like and for which they are not fitted. The things which brought them to professorships—teaching and scholarship—must be neglected to some extent. Each institution will need to develop its own pattern of roles and relationships. The important thing is that *individual* talents and limitations, preferences and aversions should be carefully considered.

This, however, is possible only where there is effective communication. The communication problems of a large, complex university are very great. They are made even more complex by the values and attitudes, referred to above, that administration is not a very worth-while activity. The ideas and problems of administrators and faculty are prevented from crossing a growing chasm. The groups stand on opposite banks and hurl epithets at each other.

Newsletters and committee meetings do not seem to be the answer. The open door policy attempted by some administrators is undesirable from a number of points of view. In those few institutions where there was good communication, it tended to take place on an informal, casual basis among people who fundamentally trusted one another. The trust was the fragile but essential end product of hard work. It usually began with the administration which first convinced the faculty that effective communication was really wanted. It was time consuming, and the time had to be taken from alumni talks, Kiwanis luncheons, and trips to woo the great foundations. These functions are sometimes good and essential, but they seem of second order importance.

One final idea. Morale must be improved. It is commonly said in books on personnel administration, that there are certain requisites for morale: first, there must be a goal which the group thinks is worthwhile; second, there must be some means of moving toward (if not actually attaining) that goal; third, that movement requires leadership; and fourth, the individuals involved must relate themselves to the goals, have a real part in the activities.

Too few colleges and universities devote sufficient time to clarifying their own goals. Statements in catalogues are commonly written by someone in the alumni office, unknown to the faculty. These pious platitudes are so vague and all-encompassing that they are unattainably short of the millennium. No institution has the resources to do everything; they must be selective. The selection of desirable and feasible goals toward which progress can be made must be a group effort and must then be carried out by trusted leadership.

The key to morale—as different from individual job satisfaction—is the group. The alternative is often found in colleges and universities: small, departmental groups striving in many different ways for self-aggrandizement with little or no thought for the welfare of the institution as a whole.

These are a few of the implications for action that seem apparent and important. There are others, and each institution and each individual will see his own. The most important thing to be kept in mind is this: colleges and universities are fundamentally human enterprises.

The social sciences are far too young to have developed the precision or substance of the natural sciences. There are, therefore, no formulas that are readily available. Each situation must be dealt with individually—with sensitivity, poise, and skill and taking into account the complex, varying, and often conflicting capabilities and wishes of the students, staff, faculty, and administration. A college or university must be administered with as much knowledge as one can obtain but, in the last analysis, with the kind of artistic flair which Whitehead has so well described.

Appendix A
Participating Institutions

Alabama

Alabama College
Montevallo, Alabama

Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama

Spring Hill College
Spring Hill, Alabama

Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

Arkansas

Arkansas Agricultural and
Mechanical College
College Heights, Arkansas

Arkansas Polytechnic College
Russville, Arkansas

Arkansas State College
State College, Arkansas

Henderson State Teachers College
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

Hendrix College
Conway, Arkansas

Ouachita Baptist College
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

Philander Smith College
Little Rock, Arkansas

Southern State College
Magnolia, Arkansas

Delaware

University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

District of Columbia

The American University
Washington, D. C.

Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Gallaudet College
Washington, D. C.

Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

George Washington University
Washington, D. C.

Howard University
Washington, D. C.

District of Columbia Teachers College
Washington, D. C.

Florida

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical
College
Tallahassee, Florida

Florida Southern College
Lakeland, Florida

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Rollins College
Winter Park, Florida

Stetson University
DeLand, Florida

University of Tampa
Tampa, Florida

Georgia

Agnes Scott College
Decatur, Georgia

Albany State College
Albany, Georgia

Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia

Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Georgia State College for Women
Milledgeville, Georgia

Georgia State College
Atlanta, Georgia

Mercer University
Macon, Georgia

Oglethorpe University
Atlanta, Georgia

Shorter College
Rome, Georgia

Wesleyan College
Macon, Georgia

Kentucky

Ashbury College
Wilmore, Kentucky

Berea College
Berea, Kentucky

Eastern Kentucky State College
Richmond, Kentucky

Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Kentucky State College
Frankfort, Kentucky

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Kentucky Wesleyan
Owensboro, Kentucky

Morehead State College
Morehead, Kentucky

Nazareth College
Louisville, Kentucky

Transylvania College
Lexington, Kentucky

Western Kentucky State College
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Louisiana

Centenary College of Louisiana
Shreveport, Louisiana

Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Northeast Louisiana State College
Monroe, Louisiana

Southern University and
A. & M. College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Southwestern Louisiana Institute
Lafayette, Louisiana

Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Newcomb College
New Orleans, Louisiana

Maryland

Goucher College
Baltimore, Maryland

Hood College
Frederick, Maryland

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

State Teachers College
Frostburg, Maryland

State Teachers College
Towson, Maryland

University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Morgan State College
Baltimore, Maryland

Mississippi

Delta State Teachers College
Cleveland, Mississippi

Jackson State College
Jackson, Mississippi

Millsaps College
Jackson, Mississippi

Mississippi College
Clinton, Mississippi

Mississippi Southern College
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Mississippi State College
State College, Mississippi

Mississippi State College for Women
Columbus, Mississippi

University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi

North Carolina

Agricultural and Technical College
of North Carolina
Greensboro, North Carolina

Appalachian State Teachers College
Boone, North Carolina

Catawba College
Salisbury, North Carolina

Davidson College
Davidson, North Carolina

East Carolina Teachers College
Greenville, North Carolina

Elizabeth City State Teachers College
Elizabeth City, North Carolina

Fayetteville State Teachers College
Fayetteville, North Carolina

Flora MacDonald College
Red Springs, North Carolina

Greensboro College
Greensboro, North Carolina

Guilford College
Guilford, North Carolina

Lenoir-Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina

Meredith College
Raleigh, North Carolina

North Carolina College
Durham, North Carolina

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Women's College of the University
of North Carolina
Greensboro, North Carolina

Queen's College
Charlotte, North Carolina

Shaw University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Oklahoma

Bethany Nazarene College
Bethany, Oklahoma

Central State College
Edmond, Oklahoma

Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Oklahoma College for Women
Chickasha, Oklahoma

University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Panhandle Agricultural and
Mechanical College
Goodwell, Oklahoma

Phillips University
Enid, Oklahoma

South Carolina

Converse College
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina

Presbyterian College
Clinton, South Carolina

South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Winthrop College
Rock Hill, South Carolina

Tennessee

Austin Peay State College
Clarksville, Tennessee

Belmont College
Nashville, Tennessee

Carson-Newman College
Jefferson City, Tennessee

University of Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

East Tennessee State College
Johnson City, Tennessee

Fisk University
Nashville, Tennessee

George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

Lincoln Memorial University
Harrogate, Tennessee

Memphis State College
Memphis, Tennessee

Middle Tennessee State College
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Southwestern University
Memphis, Tennessee

Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial
State University
Nashville, Tennessee

Tennessee Polytechnic Institute
Cookeville, Tennessee

University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Union University
Jackson, Tennessee

Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

Texas

Abilene Christian College
Abilene, Texas

Agricultural and Mechanical College
of Texas
College Station, Texas

East Texas State Teachers College
Commerce, Texas

Prairie View A & M College
Prairie View, Texas

Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

Southwest Texas Teachers College
San Marcos, Texas

Stephen F. Austin State College
Nacogdoches, Texas

Texas College of Arts and Industry
Kingsville, Texas

Texas Woman's College
Denton, Texas

Texas Western College
El Paso, Texas

Texas Wesleyan College
Fort Worth, Texas

Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas

University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Virginia

Bridgewater College
Bridgewater, Virginia

College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Hampden-Sydney College
Hampden-Sydney, Virginia

Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia

Hollins College
Hollins College, Virginia

Lynchburg College
Lynchburg, Virginia

Madison College
Harrisonburg, Virginia

Mary Baldwin College
Staunton, Virginia

Randolph-Macon College
Ashland,Virginia

Randolph-Macon Women's College
Lynchburg, Virginia

Roanoke College
Salem, Virginia

Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

Virginia Military Institute
Lexington, Virginia

Radford College
Radford, Virginia

Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia

University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Mary Washington College of the
University of Virginia
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Richmond Professional Institute
Richmond, Virginia

West Virginia

Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia

Davis and Elkins College
Elkins, West Virginia

Fairmont State College
Fairmont, West Virginia

Marshall College
Huntington, West Virginia

Morris Harvey College
Charlestown, West Virginia

Appendix B
Interview Outline

Outlined below are the major areas or topics of concern for the interviews. It is not essential that the topics be dealt with in the order listed although this order has worked out fairly well in past interviews. In some cases, you will find that questions are answered in the discussion on some other points.

We are not concerned with achieving great depth with these interviews. Because the time is limited, it is ordinarily impossible to develop a high degree of rapport with the subject. Sometimes, subjects will throw out "leads" in their comments which may, if followed up or responded to, get you quickly into personality dynamics at depth. Such leads should be noted, of course, but ordinarily, they should not be followed. Subjects may become frightened when they realize that they are "letting down their hair" to comparative strangers. At the same time, we need to get beyond the surface answers and superficialities. Deciding where to draw the line is difficult, but it must be drawn.

What we are interested in is an opportunity to talk through a number of possibilities with the subjects, most of whom have done considerable thinking about why they chose their fields and their jobs. There are some areas of interest (for instance, the attitudes of the wife or the individual's role identification) for which satisfactory questionnaire items could not be developed. We hope that the interviews will get at these presumably important areas.

In introducing the interview, I have had fairly good results with an opening such as the following: "From the questionnaire you have seen, you probably have a pretty good idea of the main purposes of this study. Fundamentally, we are interested in discovering why people choose to enter college teaching and why some of them then leave it for other positions. We recognize that a questionnaire, no matter how carefully prepared, may not be able to bring to light all of the important considerations. For this reason, we have arranged to interview a small sample of people. The interview, then, is intended to be simply a further discussion along lines already indicated in the questionnaire. We are not interested in this study in probing deeply but do feel the need to get at things which the questionnaire may have missed or slighted." (You may have to reassure the subject about the confidentiality of his responses.)

A. *Personal and professional history.* I have found that it is rarely necessary to ask the specific questions outlined below. Rather, I think it is enough to get the individual to give a brief, chronological outline of the steps through which he went in arriving at whatever job he now holds. This should begin with some discussion of his home background. I have found it useful to make a statement such as the following: "Frequently, we find that the choice of a career has its roots in the individual's background, beginning as far back as his home. I wonder whether you would tell me something about your background and the steps you went through to get where you are."

1. *Family tradition and climate.* Here, we are concerned with such things as whether the parents, even though perhaps uneducated, emphasized education as valuable and desirable, whether they encouraged (forced) the individual to achieve well in school. Perhaps the parents read a great deal or encouraged the subject to do so.
2. *Reactions to school.* This is related to a hypothesis that many college professors have found school to be an exceedingly rewarding and supporting environment. We are interested in whether the individual liked or disliked school, was submissive or rebellious.
3. *Socio-economic background.* This should include not only actual status but also the level of aspiration. It is important to get at perceived status (poor but genteel) as well as relative status (was the family share-croppers or among gentlemen farmers). It is also essential that we get at the individual's reactions to whatever status his family had.

B. *Choice of a career.*

1. *Who were the "significant others" and what were they like?* This question is often answered in connection with A1, 2, or 3 above. We are interested in really significant figures. Answers such as "several teachers along the way" should be recorded but not necessarily (unless you feel that one might have been important) followed up by asking "What was he like?" Parents and other relatives are, of course, to be included in this section.
2. *What other career possibilities (besides teaching)*

did you consider? This is also frequently answered in the replies given in section A above. It is, however, important to get some idea of the relative ordering of the choices in terms of strength or attraction.

3. *What were the attitudes of the parents toward college teaching and toward the chosen field?* This question has provided very little in most interviews ("It was up to me!"), but in a few cases, it seems to be a significant item.
4. *What were (are) the wife's attitudes toward college teaching?* (Note: for former teachers, this has to be modified to include the wife's attitudes toward leaving teaching and toward the present job.) This item is related to the hypothesis that the wife's attitudes may be critical. It is desirable to get at the basis for her feelings. For instance, many wives are either present or former teachers and feel very strongly attached to teaching as a career.
5. *How much planning entered into the decision to enter college teaching?* (Note: for former teachers, this must also include a discussion of the planning that entered into the decision to leave college work). This is frequently answered in connection with section A above, but it is usually advisable to add a statement such as: "In general, then, would you say that your decision to enter college teaching of ——————was pretty well planned, or was there quite a bit of chance or drift involved?"

C. *Values and attitudes.*

1. *Professional role identification.* I have found that I can get at this fairly well with a statement such as the following: "We are interested in how you think of yourself occupationally. For example, if you take individuals in the same department, one will describe himself as, for instance, a chemist. He identifies himself with other research workers in the field. Another may describe himself as a teacher of chemistry. Still a third might think of himself as a faculty member at——————University. Considering these three general possibilities, I wonder whether you can fit yourself in somewhere." For former teachers, as well as for graduate students, this will have to be modified slightly to take their situations into account. It may be, for example, that those who identify most with the profession or discipline are easiest to move out of college teaching.
2. *Activities.* Here, we are concerned with what the individual does and how he reacts to what he does. That is, you might ask him what are the things he does that he likes and what are things he does that he dislikes. For former teachers, you should get this about the present job as well as the former (teaching) job. Sometimes, the responses will be in terms of general characteristics—"I have complete freedom"—rather than specific duties.
3. *Rewards.* Here, we are concerned with several aspects of the reward structure.
   a. *What is the ideal job?* This can be approached by a question such as the following: "Suppose that you could write yourself an ideal job description. What would you put in, and what would you leave out?" Some people need help to get going on this one; others simply cannot deal with it.
   b. *How important is the intellectual community of the college or university campus?* Here, we are concerned with the rewards which the individual gets from interacting with colleagues in other departments, from attending lectures, concerts, etc. It is necessary that you watch for the distinction between colleagues in the subject's department and those in other departments. You should also get an estimate of the strength of the desire: "I don't do as much as I would like." For former teachers, you should find out how important it was to them, how much they miss it, and how much of a substitute they achieve in their present positions.
   c. *Rewards outside college teaching.* This item is concerned (for present faculty, at least) with how green the grass looks on the other side of the fence. For former faculty members, it will have to deal with the things which (so far as they can tell) attracted them to take a non-teaching job.
   d. *Range of rewards.* Here, the concern is with the individual's concern (or lack thereof) about the range of rewards. This has two aspects: (1) the actual range between instructor and professor; (2) the effective range which has allegedly been reduced by the relative ease with which individuals can go from instructor to professor. In the second case, the concern is with whether the individual foresees a dead end looming up at a fairly early age. If not, what rewards does he see as available to keep him intrigued with his job?

D. *Institutional policies and practices.*

1. *Teaching load and other responsibilities.* The concern here is with whether the individual feels that his teaching load and other responsibilities (committee assignments, advisement load, etc.) are satisfactory or are too heavy. If the latter, an estimate should be obtained about how much irritation is involved. For former teachers, information about present responsibilities and also responsibilities in the last teaching job should be obtained.
2. *Research facilities and support.* This item refers to facilities and support provided by the institution (or other employer as well as former employer). A check should be made of the facilities and support which are provided on contractual bases. Find out also whether the individual feels that the university should do more to provide such support or whether he feels content with what he has or can get.

3. *Participation in administration.* This is concerned with the extent to which the individual actually participates in policy formulation in the institution and department. It is also concerned with how much he wants to participate. It is necessary to check on this participation in terms of the individual's rank. In some cases, you may get responses such as, "I don't have much to say now as an instructor, but the full professors have a lot to say." You should also seek to estimate how important this participation is to the individual. In other words, is lack of participation a source of irritation? It is usually necessary to deal with the department and the institution separately.

4. *Communication pattern.* This has to do with how good or open the channels of communication are—upward and downward. In other words, the question is whether the individual feels (felt) that his problems can be freely communicated upward and that important (to him) actions are quickly transmitted downward. Again, you should estimate how much of a problem or source of irritation this is to the individual.

E. *Miscellaneous.*

1. *Status of college teaching.* The question is whether the individual feels that the status and prestige of college teaching have increased or decreased in the recent (unspecified time) past. You should also ascertain how the individual feels such changes (if any) have taken place and how they affect his attitudes toward college teaching as a career.

2. *Status of department and institution.* Here again, it is usually necessary that these be dealt with separately. Status has to do here with prestige of "goodness." Avoid, if possible, specifying the comparative reference group, but note the one used. For instance, the individual may say, "This department does as good a job of teaching undergraduates as any of the teacher colleges in the state." It is also important to find out how important departmental and institutional prestige and status are to the individual, how they would (or did) affect his occupational decisions.

3. *Plan to remain in teaching?* This applies directly only to present faculty members. They should be queried about what it might take to get them to leave teaching. Non-teachers should be queried about what it might take to get them to change their minds.

4. (For present faculty only) *Are you glad that you became a teacher?* This is a "If you had it do all over again . . ." item. It frequently provokes some interesting responses.

Once you have covered the above outline, I would suggest that you permit the subject to add anything he feels may have been missed. This can be done with a statement such as: "Well, Dr.————, we have covered a lot of ground, but there may be some things which we have missed. The basic question is: why did you become a college teacher? Perhaps there is something you would like to add that will help us to understand this. (Also, why you chose to leave college teaching.)"

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Appendix C

Sample Questionnaires*

---

*Only Forms F (faculty) and A (administrators) included. Forms L (former teachers) and G (graduate students) are quite similar to Form F in most respects.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-- NOT FILMED

Code Number *Form F*

A. *Personal and Professional History*

1. Your age: (check)
   - 20-24 ____
   - 25-29 ____
   - 30-34 ____
   - 35-39 ____
   - 40-44 ____
   - 45-49 ____
   - 50-54 ____
   - 55-59 ____
   - 60-64 ____
   - 65-older ____
2. Sex: Male ____ Female ____
3. Place of birth: ________________________
4. Religious affiliation: (check)
   - Catholic ____
   - Jewish ____
   - Protestant ____
   - None ____
   - Other (specify) ________________________
5. Size of community in which you were brought up: (check)
   - ____a. Farm
   - ____b. Village (under 2500)
   - ____c. Town (2500-10,000)
   - ____d. Small City (10,000-100,000)
   - ____e. Large City (over 100,000)
6. Marital status: (check) ____ Married; ____ Single; ____ Divorced; ____ Separated; ____ Widowed
   - a. Your age at marriage ____ (or first marriage if more than one)
7. Wife (or husband): a. Place of birth ________________________
   - b. Education (highest grade or degree) ____________ c. Major field ____________
   - d. Hobbies: (check)
     - ____1. Music
     - ____2. Dramatics
     - ____3. Art
     - ____4. Sports
     - ____5. Writing
     - ____6. Interior decorating
     - ____7. Foods and cooking
     - ____8. Sewing
     - ____9. Other (specify)
   - e. Activities: (check)
     - ____1. Participate in social, community, and religious groups.
     - ____2. Organize social, community and religious groups.
     - ____3. Professional groups
     - ____4. Other (specify)
   - f. Does your wife (or husband) work? Yes ____ No ____
     - 1. If yes, full time ____ or part time ____?
     - 2. At what kind of job? ________________________
8. Children: sex and ages ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____
9. Please complete the following for parents and siblings (If deceased, circle the age of death).

Relationship	Birthplace	Age	Education (Highest Grade)	Occupation	Religious Affiliation
a. Father					
b. Mother					
c. Brother					
d. Brother					
e. Brother					
f. Sister					
g. Sister					
h. Sister					

10. In the community in which you were brought up, was your family considered to be in the: (check)
___ a. Above average income group; ___ b. Average income group; ___ c. Below average income group.

11. How many times did you change home communities?
a. Before completing your college (bachelor's) training? __________
b. After completing your college training? __________
(Note: Do not include moves while in armed forces.)

12. Educational History:

	Level		
	Secondary	College	Graduate
a. Name(s)	1.	1.	1.
	2.	2.	2.
	3.	3.	3.
b. Location(s)	1.	1.	1.
	2.	2.	2.
	3.	3.	3.
c. Dates of Attendance	1.	1.	1.
	2.	2.	2.
	3.	3.	3.
d. Age at Graduation			
e. Major	▨		
f. Minor(s)	▨		
g. Degree Received	▨		

13. What was your approximate class standing in: (check)

	Lowest Quarter	Between 25 and 50 Percent	Between 50 and 75 Percent	Between 75 and 90 Percent	Upper 10 Percent
a. High School					
b. College					
c. Graduate School					

14. Did you graduate from college with any of the following honors? (check)

___ a. cum laude
___ b. magna cum laude
___ c. summa cum laude
___ d. Phi Beta Kappa
___ e. Tau Beta Pi
___ f. Other (specify) ______________________

15. In college, how many times did you change your major? (check)
___ a. none; ___ b. once; ___ c. twice; ___ d. more than twice.

16. Excluding summer jobs and occasional odd jobs, were you gainfully employed (full or part time):
___ a. during high school; ___ b. during college; ___ c. during graduate school?

17. Living arrangements: (check)

____a. Own your own home
____b. Rent a house
____c. Rent an apartment
____d. Other (specify) ____________________

e. How satisfactory do you consider your present living accommodations to be? (check)

Quite Unsatisfactory	Fairly Unsatisfactory	Fairly Satisfactory	Quite Satisfactory

18. Your present position:

a. Official title ____________________
b. Employer ____________________
c. Beginning date of employment ____________________
d. Salary: (1) initial ____________________
(2) present ____________________
e. Is this salary for:
(1) academic year? ______
(2) calendar year? ______

19. Occupational History: Please list, in chronological order beginning with your *first* job, your work experience since college graduation. Do *not* include either your present job, military experience, or positions of less than three months' duration. List promotions within the same institution as separate jobs (i.e., assistant to associate professor).

Job Title	Employer	Dates	Salary*	
			Initial	Final
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

**Please indicate salary on academic year basis.*

20. Social activities: Please indicate by a check (√) the number of clubs and other extra-curricular activities in which you participated while in:

	Several	A Few	One	None
a. High school				
b. College				
c. Graduate school				

21. Social and community activities: Please check (√) those social and community activities in which you participate regularly or frequently. Double check (√√) the *two* in which you are most active and/or interested. If you have been an officer (or committee member) in the last five years, *circle* the check marks.

____a. Church
____b. PTA
____c. Lodges and Fraternal orders (Masons, Elks, etc.)
____d. Civic clubs (Kiwanis, Rotary, etc.)
____e. Political clubs or organizations

___ f. Voluntary health or welfare organizations (Red Cross, Community Chest, etc.

___ g. Youth groups (YMCA, YWCA, Boy Scouts, CYO, etc.)

___ h. Other (specify) ____________________

22. Professional affiliations and activities:

    a. During your professional career to date, please indicate:

        1. Number of scientific and scholarly articles published ________
        2. Number of scientific and scholarly books published ________
        3. Number of papers read at professional meetings ________

    b. Professional association activity:

        1. In column A below, check (✓) those professional groups of which you are a member. Double check (✓✓) those in which you hold or have held offices (appointed or elected) or committee memberships.
        2. In column B below, check (✓) to indicate whether you usually attend the annual meetings of these groups.

Group or Society	A	B
1. American Association for the Advancement of Science		
2. American Chemical Society		
3. American Personnel and Guidance Association		
4. American Psychological Association		
5. Association of Teachers of College English		
6. Modern Language Association		
7. Regional Language Association		
8. Southeastern Psychological Association		
9. State Society of your association		
10. Other (specify)		

B. Choice of a Career

1. In column A below, please check the point in your life at which you decided on a career in college teaching. In column B, please check the point at which you selected your present field of specialization.

	A	B
a. Prior to high school		
b. During high school		
c. During junior college		
d. During senior college		

	A	B
e. During first half of graduate work		
f. During second half of graduate work		
g. Immediately after completing graduate work		
h. After experience in a non-teaching position		

2. Who do you think most influenced you in your choice of a college teaching as a career? Check (✓) those who influenced you, double check (✓✓) the single most important.

___ a. Father
___ b. Mother
___ c. Brother(s) or Sister(s)
___ d. Other relative
___ e. A friend

___ f. High school teacher
___ g. College teacher
___ h. School or college administrator
___ i. Counselor or adviser
___ j. Other (specify) ____________________

3. How do you think your parents felt about your choice of college teaching? (check)

Very Opposed Neutral Very Favorable

4. If you were married at the time, how do you think your wife felt about your decision to enter college teaching? (check)
(If **not** married at the time, check here_____)

Very Opposed Neutral Very Favorable

5. Do you feel that your decision to enter college teaching was based on: (check)

Pure Chance Mostly Chance Mostly Planned Careful planning and deliberation

6. How much time did you spend in reaching your decision? (check)

Very Little A Fair Amount Quite a Bit A great deal

C. *Values and attitudes*

1. Professional role. All faculty are members of the institution and of professional disciplines. Some look more to the institution than to the professional group; they tend to participate in more institutional activities. Others look more to the professional group and participate more in professional affairs. Compared with other faculty members in your institution and particularly as compared with other members of your department, how would you rate yourself with respect to this dimension?

I am much *less* interested in professional activities than my colleagues. I am much *more* interested in professional activities than my colleagues.

NOTE: *In questions 2 and 3 which follow, you are asked to make ratings of a number of things. The rating scales all consist of five points, ranging from one to five. In general, a rating of five indicates most, a rating of one, least. In selecting the numbers to indicate your ratings, it is important that you use the full scale. There will be some things about which you feel strongly. For these, a one or a five rating is appropriate. There will be others about which you feel less strongly. For these, you might use a rating of two or four. On others, you will be essentially neutral, and three will indicate this. What we want are your reactions, not your estimates about some hypothetical others feel.*

2. Activities. College professors engage in a wide variety of activities. Listed below are some of the more common of these. Would you indicate in column:

A the *actual amount* of time you devote to each activity? Do this by entering in column A the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to you. (5–half time or more; 4–one quarter to one half time; 3–fifteen to twenty-five percent time; 2–five to fifteen percent time; 1–less than five percent time.)

B the amount of time you would *like* to spend in each activity? Do this by entering in column B the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to you. (5–a great deal more than at present; 4–some more than present; 3–about the same; 2–some less than present; 1–a great deal less than at present.)

C how, when you were a graduate student, you *expected* to spend your time once you had a college teaching position? Do this by entering in column C the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to you. (5–half time or more; 4–one quarter to one half time; 3–fifteen to twenty-five percent time; 2–five to fifteen percent time; 1–less than five percent time.)

D the way you feel the administration of your institution weighs these activities in considering staff members for promotion or salary increases? Do this by entering in column D the number preceding the one of the following phrases which expresses your estimate. (5–very heavily weighted; 4–seriously considered; 3–considered but not heavily; 2–considered very little; 1–almost totally ignored.)

E how you feel that the administration of your institution *ought* to weigh these activities in considering staff members for promotion or salary increases? Do this by entering in Column E the number preceding the one of the phrases which expresses your estimate best. (5–very heavily weighted; 4–seriously considered; 3–considered but not very heavily; 2–considered very little; 1–almost totally ignored.)

	A	B	C	D	E
1. Teaching upper division courses					
2. Teaching lower division courses					
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars					
4. Advising undergraduate students					
5. Advising graduate students					
6. Serving on departmental committees					
7. Serving on university or college committees					
8. Supervising graduate dissertations					
9. Conducting your own research					
10. Counseling with students					
11. Writing professional books, articles					
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)					
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)					
14. Consulting with industry or government.					
15. Administration					
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.					
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.					
18. Other (specify)					

3. Rewards. There are many things which college professors find challenging or rewarding about their jobs. Listed below are some of the more common of these rewards. Would you indicate in Column:

A how *important* each of these rewards is to you? Do this by entering in column A the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to you. (5–extremely important; 4–very important; 3–moderately important; 2–relatively unimportant; 1–quite unimportant.)

B how *available* you feel these rewards are in your present position? Do this by entering in column B the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to you. (5–definitely available; 4–generally available; 3–somewhat available; 2–only slightly available, 1–almost or completely unavailable.)

C how important each of these rewards was to you when you were a graduate student? Do this by entering in column C the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to you. (5–extremely important; 4–very important; 3–moderately important; 2–relatively unimportant; 1–quite unimportant.)

D how the availability of these rewards compare in college teaching as contrasted with business or industry? Do this by entering in column D the number preceding the one of the following phrases which best describes your estimate. (5–definitely more available in college teaching; 4–somewhat more available in college teaching; 3–about equally available in both settings; 2–somewhat more available in government or industry; 1–definitely more available in government or industry.)

E the things you would consider in deciding on a teaching position in another institution? Do this by entering in column E the number preceding the one of the following phrases which best describes your feeling. (5–highly important; 4–very important, 3–moderately important; 2–slightly important; 1–unimportant.)

	A	B	C	D	E
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me.					
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues					
3. Intellectual stimulation from students					
4. Adequate salary					
5. Status and prestige in the community					
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)					
7. Security					
8. Congenial social group					
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them					
10. Independence of thought and action					
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work					
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)					
13. Recognition of my work by administration					
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues					
15. Opportunity to be of service to community					
16. Opportunity for advancement					
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge					
18. Other (specify)					

D. *Institutional policies and practices*

1. Listed below are some of the so-called "fringe" benefits available in many institutions. Please check (√) the one(s) available in your institution and double check (√√) those which are available to a satisfactory degree.

   ___a. Retirement program
   ___b. Social security
   ___c. Medical care plan (Blue Cross or equivalent)
   ___d. Sabbatical leave
   ___e. Credit union
   ___f. Loans for housing
   ___g. University housing
   ___h. Expenses paid to meetings
   ___i. Tuition free or reduced for family members
   ___j. Other (specify)___________________

2. What is your present teaching load (in class hours per week)?__________

3. Is an allowance made explicitly (by added pay, reduced teaching, etc.) for any of the following activities? Check (√) if allowance is made, and double check (√√) if the allowance is adequate.

   ___a. Advising undergraduates
   ___b. Advising graduates
   ___c. Directing theses
   ___d. Research
   ___e. Counseling students
   ___f. Faculty committee work
   ___g. Administration
   ___h. Advising student clubs
   ___i. Other (specify)___________________
   ____

4. Does your institution provide financial support for research that is as adequate as is provided by comparable institutions? Yes_____ No_____

5. What is your institutions attitude toward outside work such as consulting?

   Definitely Opposed — Indifferent — Favorable

6. To what extent are you able to:

   a. Select the courses you will teach? Not at all — To some extent — Completely

   b. Determine the hours at which you teach? Not at all — To some extent — Completely

   c. Determine course content and teaching methods? Not at all — To some extent — Completely

   d. Set the hours when you are on campus (except for class meetings)? Not at all — To some extent — Completely

7. How do you feel about the administration of your:

   a. Department? Very autocratic — Usually autocratic — Usually democratic — Very democratic

   b. Institution? Very autocratic — Usually autocratic — Usually democratic — Very democratic

8. In terms of the administrative structure and climate (formal and informal) of your institution, how much real opportunity do you feel that faculty members have to:

   a. Take part in determining policy for the institution?

Practically none	Very little	Quite a bit	A great deal

   b. Take part in determining policy for the department?

Practically none	Very little	Quite a bit	A great deal

9. How effective is the communication system (formal and informal) in your institution?

   a. Downward from the board, president, dean, and department head to you?

Poor – I am almost always in the dark about affairs of the institution.	Excellent – I am well informed about affairs of the institution.

   b. Upward from you to the department head, dean, president, and board?

Poor – I feel that my activities and problems get lost in channels.	Excellent – I feel that they are aware of my activities and problems.

E. *Miscellaneous*

1. What do you think has happened to the prestige and status of the profession of college teaching during the past quarter century? (check)_____ a. Increased;_____ b. Remained about the same;_____ c. Decreased.

   If you indicated a change, what reason(s) do you feel are most important in explaining such change?

   ____

   ____

2. All other things being approximately equal, in what part of the country would you most like to live?

   ____a. New England
   ____b. Middle Atlantic
   ____c. Southeast
   ____d. Southwest
   ____e. Middle West
   ____f. Plains States
   ____g. Rocky Mountains
   ____h. West Coast

3. What is your ultimate professional goal?

   ____a. Professor
   ____b. Research professor
   ____c. Department chairman
   ____d. Dean
   ____e. President
   ____f. Other (specify)________________________

   With respect to this goal, do you feel that:
   a. You have attained it? Yes____ No____ Uncertain________
   b. You have a reasonably good chance of attaining it in your present institution?
   Yes____ No____ Uncertain_______
   c. You have a reasonable good chance of attaining it in some other college or university?
   Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_______

4. Do you expect to remain in college teaching? Yes____ Uncertain____ No ______
   a. In your present institution? Yes ____ Uncertain_____No ________

5. Compared with other institutions and departments of about the same size and type:
   a. How does your ***institution*** stand with respect to reputation and prestige?

   Below average | About average | Upper quarter | Upper ten percent

   b. How does your ***department*** stand with respect to reputation and prestige?

   Below average | About average | Upper quarter | Upper ten percent

6. Approximately how may job offers and inquiries have you received in the last year:

	Formal	Informal*
a. From other colleges and universities		
b. From government or industry		
c. From other sources (specify)		

**By informal is meant any inquiry which you feel might have resulted in a definite offer if pursued further by you.*

7. Have you ever had any formal training for teaching? Yes_____ No ______
   a. If not, do you wish that you had had such training? Yes_____ No ______

F. *Interests and attitudes*

On the following pages, there are some questions designed to assess the attitudes and interests of college teachers. These questions have been selected from a carefully standardized and widely used test because they relate most closely to the problem we are studying: the choice of a career in college teaching.

Many of the questions will not seem to be obviously related to the major problem, but all have been shown to be so. Job attitudes and interests must necessarily cover a wide range of activities and reactions if they are to measure the total situation. By comparing the answers given to these questions by different groups, we hope to be able to describe the attitudes and interests of which will enable us to understand better the choice of a career in college teaching.

INSTRUCTIONS

Read each statement quickly but carefully, and indicate the degree to which it applies to you by placing an "X" in the space below the appropriate number on the "Agreement Scale". Work quickly; your first reaction is the most valuable.

Sample "Agreement Scale":

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly agree		Somewhat agree	Undecided		Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	1. The idea of doing research appeals to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	2. I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	3. I like to influence the opinions and attitudes of other people directly, that is, by talking, persuading, etc.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	4. I would like a job which requires that I travel out of town frequently.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	5. I doubt whether I would make a good leader.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	6. I would take a job which pays a very high salary, but where success is uncertain.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	7. I like to work closely with other people.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	8. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	9. It is hard for me to sympathize with someone who is always doubting and unsure about things.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	10. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 11. I am often bothered by useless thoughts which keep running through my mind.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 12. A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 13. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 14. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 15. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 16. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 17. A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 18. I like large, noisy parties.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 19. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 20. I certainly feel useless at times.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 21. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 22. I think I would enjoy having authority over other people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 23. I like a job where I make judgments according to measurable standards.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 24. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 25. I often wish people would be more definite about things.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 26. I like poetry.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 27. I must admit I find it very hard to work under strict rules and regulations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ 28. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 29. I often lose my temper.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 30. Disobedience to any government is never justified.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 31. Every citizen should take the time to find out about national affairs even if it means giving up some personal pleasures.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 32. I usually have to stop and think before I act even in trifling matters.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 33. The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 34. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 35. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 36. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 37. A strong person will be able to make up his mind even on the most difficult questions.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 38. Society owes a lot more to the businessman and the manufacturer than it does to the artist and the professor.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 39. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 40. I would be willing to give money myself in order to right a wrong, even though I was not mixed up in it in the first place.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 41. Parents are much too easy on their children nowadays.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 42. I often start things I never finish.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 43. I do not like to see people carelessly dressed.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 44. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 45. I often get disgusted with myself.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 46. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	47. I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as freewill, evil, etc.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	48. Our thinking would be a lot better off is we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps."
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	49. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	50. My parents were always very strict and stern with me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	51. I would be very unhappy if I was not successful at something I had seriously started to do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	52. I used to like it very much when one of my papers was read to the class in school.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	53. It is always a good thing to be frank.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	54. Teachers often expect too much work from the students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	55. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	56. I am embarrassed with people I do not know well.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	57. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	58. I much prefer symmetry to asymmetry.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	59. I like "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	60. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	61. I would like to write a technical book.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	62. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	63. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	64. I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	65. We ought to pay our elected officials better than we do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	66. Sometimes, without any reason or even when things are going wrong, I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	67. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	68. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	69. I like a job where the work must be performed according to a set time schedule.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	70. I have strong political opinions.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	71. Planning one's activities in advance is very likely to take most of the fun out of life.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	72. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	73. I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea how it will turn out.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	74. Only a fool would try to change our American way of life.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	75. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	76. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	77. Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	78. I can honestly say that I do not really mind paying my taxes because I feel that's one of the things I can do for what I get from the community.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	79. I usually go to the movies more than once a week.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	80. I am a better talker than a listener.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	81. I may take a job where the work itself is uninteresting to me, but which provides me with considerable recognition and admiration from others.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	82. I was a slow learner in school.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	83. I like work which keeps me busy all the time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	84. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	85. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	86. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	87. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	88. I am at my best when working under stress, that is, where I must deal with unexpected situations and make quick decisions.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	89. I like a job where I work around people whose interests are very similar to mine.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	90. I believe we are made better by the trials and hardships of life.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	91. I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	92. There are times when I act like a coward.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	93. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	94. I would rather not have very much responsibility for other people.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	95. I always like to keep my things neat and tidy and in good order.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	96. In school I always looked far ahead in planning what courses to take.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	97. People seem naturally to turn to me when decisions have to be made.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	98. Most people worry too much about sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	99. I find it easy to ''drop'' or ''break with'' a friend.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	100. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.

Code Number

Form A

A. *Institutional policies and practices*

1. Listed below are some of the so-called "fringe" benefits available in many institutions. Please check (✓) the one(s) available to your faculty, and double check (✓✓) those which you feel are available to a satisfactory degree as compared with other institutions.

____ a. Retirement program (exclusive of social security)
____ b. Social security
____ c. Medical care plan (Blue Cross or equivalent)
____ d. Sabbatical leave
____ e. Credit union
____ f. Loans for housing
____ g. University housing
____ h. Expenses paid to meetings
____ i. Tuition free or reduced for family members
____ j. Other (specify) ____________________

2. What is the normal teaching load (in class hours per week) of full time teaching faculty members? ________
Do many of your faculty deviate (either above or below) significantly from the normal load? Yes ___ No ___

3. Is an allowance made explicitly (by added pay, reduced teaching, etc.) for any of the following activities? Check (✓) if allowance is made, and double check (✓✓) if the allowance is adequate.

____ a. Advising undergraduates
____ b. Advising graduates
____ c. Directing theses
____ d. Research
____ e. Counseling students
____ f. Faculty committee work
____ g. Administration
____ h. Advising student clubs
____ i. Other (specify) ____________________

4. Do you provide direct financial support (from university funds) for faculty research? Yes ____ No ____
If yes, do you feel that the amounts provided compare favorably with those in other institutions of the same size and type? Yes ____ No ____ Uncertain ______

5. Do you provide funds to pay for travel of faculty members to meetings of their professional societies?
Yes _____ No _____
If yes, do you pay for all expenses? Yes _____ No _____
For all faculty or only some? All _____ Some ______

6. What is the institutional policy regarding outside work (such as consulting) by faculty members?

|____|____|____|____|____|

Definitely opposed — Indifferent — Quite Favorable

7. To what extent are faculty members permitted to:

a. Select the courses they will teach?
|____|____|____|____|____|
Not at all — To some extent — Completely

b. Determine the hours at which they will teach?
|____|____|____|____|____|
Not at all — To some extent — Completely

c. Determine course content and teaching methods?
|____|____|____|____|____|
Not at all — To some extent — Completely

d. Set their hours for being on campus (aside from class meetings)?
|____|____|____|____|____|
Not at all — To some extent — Completely

8. How effective do you feel that the communication system (formal and informal) is in your institution?

   a. Downward from the board, president, dean, to the faculty?

      Poor Fair Excellent

   b. Upward from the faculty to the dean, president, and board?

      Poor Fair Excellent

B. *Values and Attitudes*

1. Professional role. All faculty are members both of the institution and of one of the professional disciplines. Some look more to the institution that to the professional group, and they tend to participate more in institutional activities. Others look more toward the profession and tend to involve themselves and participate more in its affairs. How would you rate the typical faculty member in your institution with respect to this dimension?

   Much less interested in professional affairs than in institutional problems.

   Much more interested in professional affairs than in institutional problems.

Note: *In questions 2 and 3 which follow, you will be asked to make ratings of a number of things. The rating scales all consist of five (5) points, ranging from one to five. In general, a rating of five indicates most, a rating of one, least. In selecting the numbers to indicate your ratings, it is important that you use the full scale. There will be some things about which you feel strongly. For these, a one or a five rating is appropriate. There will be others about which you feel less strongly. For these, you might use a rating of two or four. On others, you will be essentially neutral, and three will indicate this. What we want are YOUR reactions, not your estimates about some hypothetical others feel.*

2. Activities. College professors engage in a wide variety of activities. Listed below are some of the more common of these. Would you, considering your experience with your staff, indicate in column:

A the typical amount of time actually spent in each activity? Do this by entering in column A the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to your staff. (5-half time or more; 4-one quarter to one half time; 3-fifteen to twenty-five percent time; 2-five to fifteen percent time; 1-less than five percent time.)

B the amount of time you think most faculty members would *like* to spend in each activity? Do this by entering in column B the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to your staff. (5-a great deal more than at present; 4-some more than at present; 3-about the same; 2-some less than at present; 1-a great deal less than at present.)

C the extent to which you consider each activity when evaluating a staff member for promotion or salary increase? Do this by entering in column D the number preceding the phrase which expresses your estimate. (5-very heavily weighted; 4-seriously considered; 3-considered but not heavily; 2-considered very little; 1-almost totally ignored.)

D the way you believe the faculty thinks that these activities *ought* to be weighted when a man is being considered for promotion or salary increase? Do this by entering in column E the number preceding the one of the phrases which expresses your estimate best. (5-very heavily weighted; 4-seriously considered; 3-considered but not very heavily; 2-considered very little; 1-almost totally ignored.)

	A	B	C	D
1. Teaching upper division courses				
2. Teaching lower division courses				
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars				
4. Advising undergraduate students				
5. Advising graduate students				
6. Serving on departmental committees				
7. Serving on university or college committees				
8. Supervising graduate dissertations				
9. Conducting own research				
10. Counseling with students				
11. Writing professional books, articles				
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in professional group				
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, PTA, church, etc.)				
14. Consulting with industry or government				
15. Administration				
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.				
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.				
18. Other (specify)				

3. Rewards. There are many things which faculty members find challenging or rewarding about their jobs. Listed below are some of the more common of these. Would you indicate in column:

A how important each of these is to most college faculty members? Do this by entering in column A the the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to your staff. (5-extremely important; 4-very important; 3-moderately important; 2-relatively unimportant; 1-quite unimportant.)

B how *available* the rewards are to faculty members in your institution? Do this by entering in column B the number preceding the one of the following phrases which applies to your staff. (5-definitely available; 4-generally available; 3-somewhat available; 2-only slightly available; 1-almost or completely unavailable.)

C how the availability of these rewards compare in your institution as compared with positions in government and industry? Do this by entering in column C the number preceding the one of the following phrases which best describes your estimate. (5-definitely more available in college teaching; 4-somewhat more available in college teaching; 3-about equally available in both settings; 2-somewhat more available in government or industry; 1-definitely more available in government or industry.)

D the things you are most concerned with improving in terms of their availability to your staff? Do this by entering in column E the number preceding the one of the following phrases which best describes your feeling. (5-must be improved at all costs; 4-very important to improve; 3-fairly important to improve; 2-not particularly important to improve; 1-present condition satisfactory.)

	A	B	C	D
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to staff				
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues				
3. Intellectual stimulation from students				
4. Adequate salary				
5. Status and prestige in the community				
6. Benefits (retirement, reduced tuition for family members, etc.)				
7. Security				
8. Congenial social group				
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them				
10. Independence of thought and action				
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which they work				
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)				
13. Recognition of work by administration				
14. Recognition of work by colleagues				
15. Opportunity to be of service to community				
16. Opportunity for advancement				
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge				
18. Other (specify)				

C. *Miscellaneous*

1. What do you think has happened to the prestige and status of the profession of college teaching during the past quarter century? (check) ____ a. Increased; ____ b. Remained about the same; ____ c. Decreased.

   If you indicated a change, what reason(s) do you feel are most important in explaining such change?

   ____

   ____

2. Compared with other institutions of about the same size and type, how does your institution stand with respect to reputation and prestige?

   Below Average | About Average | Upper Quarter | Upper Ten Percent

3. What has been your average turn-over rate (faculty members leaving for other jobs) in the past five years? (Do not include faculty who have retired or died)

Number left	Year
________	1952–53
________	1953–54
________	1954–55
________	1955–56
________	1956–57

4. What is the salary range in your institution for each of the academic ranks:

	Base	Average	Top
a. Professor			
b. Associate Professor			
c. Assistant Professor			
d. Instructor			

5. Selection policies:
   a. When hiring new faculty, do you require the PhD for:
      1. Professors? Yes____Usually____No____
      2. Associate Professors? Yes____Usually____No____
      3. Assistant Professors? Yes____Usually____No____
      4. Instructors? Yes____Usually____No____
   b. Do you have any selection requirements with respect to:
      1. Religious affiliation? Yes____No____
      2. Sex? Yes____No____
      3. Age? Yes____No____

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK—NOT FILMED

Appendix D Tables

TABLE I
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University Chemistry Teachers

Reward Values	*Importance of reward*	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.1	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.4
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.1
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.7	3.2	3.3	4.7	3.8
4. Adequate salary	3.7	2.9	3.1	1.2	3.9
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.2
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	2.9	3.2	2.4	1.7	4.0
7. Security	3.0	3.7	2.7	3.1	3.3
8. Congenial social group	3.3	4.0	2.4	3.2	3.5
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.8	4.1	3.5	4.5	3.8
10. Independence of thought and action	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.5
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.8	3.2	3.3	3.9	4.1
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	4.3	3.9	4.1	4.4	4.4
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.4	3.2	[illegible]	2.1	3.9
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.7	3.7	[illegible]	2.6	3.7
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.2	3.4	2.7	2.9	3.1
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.6	3.4	3.7	2.0	3.9
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.8

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE II
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Chemistry Teachers

Reward Values	*Importance of reward*	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.1	3.0	4.5	3.8	3.4
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.1	3.6	4.1	3.1	2.9
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.6	3.7	3.2	4.7	2.1
4. Adequate salary	4.0	1.8	3.3	1.4	4.7
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.2	2.9	2.5	3.1	2.3
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	2.9	2.0	2.2	1.8	3.0
7. Security	2.8	2.4	1.9	1.7	3.4
8. Congenial social group	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.2	2.2
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.6	4.1	2.8	4.1	2.4
10. Independence of thought and action	4.1	3.7	4.2	3.5	2.9
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.8	2.7	3.4	3.2	2.7
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.5	3.2	3.8	4.0	2.8
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.9	2.8	3.6	2.2	3.9
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.9	3.4	3.6	2.6	2.8
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.4	2.9	2.4	2.9	2.2
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.9	2.7	3.3	2.0	4.0
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.1	2.5

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE III
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College Chemistry Teachers

Reward Values	*Importance of reward*	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	3.8	2.5	4.0	3.7	4.2
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	3.8	3.3	3.9	3.5	3.9
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.6	3.2	3.3	4.4	3.7
4. Adequate salary	3.9	3.1	3.5	1.4	4.3
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.4
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	3.2	3.4	2.3	1.9	3.6
7. Security	3.4	3.3	2.7	2.6	3.8
8. Congenial social group	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.5
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	4.3	4.5	3.6	4.8	4.1
10. Independence of thought and action	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.4	3.9
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.8	3.8
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.5	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.5
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.3	3.4	3.6	2.9	3.5
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.0	3.3
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.1
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.8	3.1	4.0	2.2	4.0
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.7	2.6	3.8	3.7	3.5

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE IV
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College Chemistry Teachers

	Importance of reward	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
Reward Values	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.1	2.4	4.8	3.8	2.9
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.0	2.8	4.6	2.7	2.3
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	4.1	2.8	4.0	4.6	1.7
4. Adequate salary	4.1	2.0	3.3	1.3	4.3
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.3	3.5	2.7	3.4	2.3
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	3.1	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.9
7. Security	2.7	2.7	2.0	2.9	2.6
8. Congenial social group	3.1	3.5	2.7	3.4	2.1
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.8	3.9	3.1	4.5	1.7
10. Independence of thought and action	4.4	2.4	4.0	3.1	2.7
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.8	2.2	3.5	2.7	2.9
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.9	2.7	4.1	3.4	2.6
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.4	3.1	3.5	2.1	3.0
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.3	3.2	3.5	2.1	2.9
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.4
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.9	2.1	3.6	1.6	3.9
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.5	1.9	3.8	2.1	2.6

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE V
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University English Teachers

	Importance of reward	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
Reward Values	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.3	3.2	4.1	4.6	4.2
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.2	3.4	4.2	3.8	5.0
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.8	3.0	3.7	4.8	3.8
4. Adequate salary	4.0	2.5	3.3	1.7	4.2
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.6	2.8
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	3.3	3.5	2.4	2.4	3.5
7. Security	3.5	3.6	3.0	2.9	3.7
8. Congenial social group	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.5
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.7	3.5
10. Independence of thought and action	4.6	3.9	4.4	3.4	4.5
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.9	3.0	3.4	3.9	3.8
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	4.1	3.5	3.9	4.0	4.1
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.7
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.2
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.3	2.6
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.5	3.4	3.7	2.8	4.1
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.7	3.4	3.8	4.1	3.7

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE VI
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University English Teachers

	Importance of reward	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
Reward Values	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.4	2.9	4.4	4.0	2.9
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	3.7	3.0	3.9	3.4	2.4
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.6	1.7
4. Adequate salary	4.1	2.0	3.7	1.5	4.7
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.1	3.2	2.7	2.5	2.3
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.5
7. Security	3.3	3.9	2.9	2.6	2.9
8. Congenial social group	4.0	3.0	3.8	3.3	2.2
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.8	2.4
10. Independence of thought and action	4.0	2.9	4.4	3.4	3.1
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.4	2.0	2.9	2.7	2.7
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.9	2.6	3.6	3.6	2.5
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.3	2.2	2.9	2.5	3.1
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.6	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.6
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.4
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.7	2.0	3.5	2.0	3.5
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.7	2.7	3.9	3.7	2.7

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE VII
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College English Teachers

Reward Values	Importance of reward	Availability of reward	Importance when I was graduate student	Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry	Things to be considered in accepting a job
	Average*	Average	Average	Average	Average
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	3.8	2.8	4.0	4.5	3.8
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.1	3.2	4.3	4.5	3.8
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.8	3.1	3.8	4.6	3.8
4. Adequate salary	3.8	3.0	3.7	1.3	4.2
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.0	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.1
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	3.5	4.0	2.8	2.1	3.5
7. Security	3.5	3.8	3.3	2.7	3.9
8. Congenial social group	3.8	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.9
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.6	4.2
10. Independence of thought and action	4.4	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.3
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.8
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.9	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.9
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.1	3.8
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.1	3.4
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.1	2.9
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.6	3.2	4.0	2.2	3.8
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.4	3.0	3.8	4.1	3.4

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE VIII
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College English Teachers

Reward Values	Importance of reward	Availability of reward	Importance when I was graduate student	Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry	Things to be considered in accepting a job
	Average*	Average	Average	Average	Average
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.2	2.4	4.0	4.1	2.0
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.1	3.4	3.9	3.8	2.1
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	4.0	3.3	4.0	4.8	1.7
4. Adequate salary	4.4	1.8	2.4	1.3	4.2
5. Status and prestige in the community	2.3	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.4
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.2	3.1
7. Security	2.8	2.8	2.1	3.0	3.1
8. Congenial social group	4.1	3.2	3.3	3.7	2.9
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	4.8	4.6	3.1	4.2	1.9
10. Independence of thought and action	4.1	2.9	3.5	2.8	3.5
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	4.2	2.7	3.0	2.8	3.1
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	4.0	2.7	3.3	3.0	3.2
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.2	2.7	2.6	2.0	3.1
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.7
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.5
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.4	2.1	3.0	1.9	3.8
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.3	2.5	2.7	3.4	2.6

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE IX
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University Psychology Teachers

Reward Values	Importance of reward	Availability of reward	Importance when I was graduate student	Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry	Things to be considered in accepting a job
	Average*	Average	Average	Average	Average
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.6	3.6	4.2	4.5	4.6
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.3	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.2
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.5	3.1	3.4	4.5	3.9
4. Adequate salary	4.1	2.9	3.3	1.5	4.3
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.2	2.7
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	2.5	3.5	2.2	3.1	3.4
7. Security	3.3	2.9	3.0	3.4	3.6
8. Congenial social group	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.9
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.4	4.0	2.9	4.0	3.2
10. Independence of thought and action	3.6	3.7	4.2	4.3	4.2
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.8	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.9
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.4	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.3
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.6	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.6
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.8	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.8
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	2.6	4.6	2.4	3.2	2.4
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.9	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.9
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	4.0	3.7	4.1	4.1	3.9

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE X
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Psychology Teachers

	Importance of reward	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
Reward Values	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	3.8	2.4	4.1	3.6	2.6
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.1	3.2	4.3	3.8	2.3
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.8	3.3	3.6	4.3	2.1
4. Adequate salary	3.8	2.1	3.3	1.0	4.4
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.5	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.5
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	3.0	2.5	2.3	2.0	3.1
7. Security	3.1	2.4	2.6	2.1	3.0
8. Congenial social group	3.4	2.3	3.5	3.1	2.3
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.5	3.6	3.3	4.0	1.9
10. Independence of thought and action	3.7	3.0	4.2	3.4	2.7
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.6	2.4	3.2	2.7	3.0
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.7	3.0	3.6	3.4	2.6
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.2	2.5	3.2	2.4	2.8
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.6	2.8	3.7	3.0	2.8
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.1	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.3
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.6	2.8	3.1	1.9	3.0
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.6	2.9	3.7	3.2	2.1

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE XI
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College Psychology Teachers

	Importance of reward	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
Reward Values	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.1	2.5	4.0	4.3	4.0
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.2	3.0	4.1	4.3	4.2
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	4.1	3.0	3.1	4.8	3.9
4. Adequate salary	3.9	2.8	3.6	1.6	4.2
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.3	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.0
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	3.3	3.4	2.6	2.3	3.6
7. Security	3.5	3.7	2.9	3.0	3.7
8. Congenial social group	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.8
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	4.1	4.1	3.4	4.5	4.1
10. Independence of thought and action	4.3	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.3
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	3.9	3.1	3.6	3.7	4.0
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	4.0	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.0
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.5	3.3	4.0	2.6	3.6
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.4
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	2.9	3.5	3.0	3.6	2.9
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.5	3.2	3.9	2.5	4.1
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.7	3.0	3.8	4.5	3.5

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE XII
Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College Psychology Teachers

	Importance of reward	*Availability of reward*	*Importance when I was graduate student*	*Availability of reward in teaching as compared with industry*	*Things to be considered in accepting a job*
Reward Values	*Average**	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*	*Average*
1. Opportunity for research and study on problems of great interest to me	4.0	2.7	3.2	3.0	3.3
2. Intellectual stimulation from colleagues	4.1	3.2	4.3	3.2	2.9
3. Intellectual stimulation from students	3.1	3.0	3.7	4.0	2.0
4. Adequate salary	3.6	2.3	3.1	1.9	4.3
5. Status and prestige in the community	3.6	2.8	3.5	2.4	2.9
6. Benefits (retirement, medical care plans, etc.)	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.0	3.1
7. Security	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	4.0
8. Congenial social group	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.0
9. Challenge of working with young people, of influencing them	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8	2.5
10. Independence of thought and action	4.2	3.0	4.0	3.4	3.1
11. Ability to take part in establishing the policies under which I work	4.0	2.0	3.2	2.5	3.1
12. Freedom from restraints (set own schedule, choose own problems for study, etc.)	3.7	2.6	3.2	2.7	2.9
13. Recognition of my work by administration	3.6	2.4	3.5	2.5	3.1
14. Recognition of my work by colleagues	3.4	3.4	3.7	2.7	2.9
15. Opportunity to be of service to community	3.5	3.4	3.5	1.8	3.2
16. Opportunity for advancement	3.8	2.1	3.6	1.7	4.1
17. Contribute to our store of knowledge	3.7	2.6	4.0	3.1	2.9

*Average on a 5 point scale from low (1) to high (5).

TABLE XIII
Job Activities of Present University Chemistry Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.0	2.3	3.1	3.2	4.0
2. Teaching lower division courses	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.2	4.0
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.7	3.4	2.8	3.1	4.0
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.0	2.4	1.5	1.9	3.0
5. Advising graduate students	1.6	2.9	1.5	1.8	2.8
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.2	2.4	1.3	2.4	2.3
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.5	2.3	1.2	2.8	2.4
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	2.0	3.3	2.4	3.2	3.7
9. Conducting your own research	2.2	3.8	3.0	3.4	4.1
10. Counseling with students	1.8	2.7	1.5	1.9	2.9
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.5	3.3	1.7	3.5	3.6
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.1	2.6	1.2	2.0	2.4
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.2	2.8	1.4	1.4	1.8
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.3	2.9	1.6	2.0	2.2
15. Administration	1.4	2.2	1.3	2.7	2.5
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.6	3.7	2.2	1.6	2.9
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.6	1.2	1.9	1.5

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XIV
Job Activities of Former University Chemistry Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	4.1
2. Teaching lower division courses	3.0	2.2	3.2	2.6	4.1
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.6	2.0	1.5	1.6	3.3
5. Advising graduate students	1.3	2.6	1.7	1.8	3.4
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.2	2.0	1.3	1.9	2.2
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.1	2.2	1.2	2.0	2.4
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.8	1.2	3.1	3.2	4.1
9. Conducting your own research	2.1	3.4	3.3	3.3	4.2
10. Counseling with students	1.4	2.5	1.4	1.9	2.9
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.3	2.8	2.2	3.4	3.7
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.1	2.5	1.2	2.0	2.4
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.1	2.1	1.2	1.4	1.8
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.3	2.6	1.4	1.7	2.2
15. Administration	1.5	2.1	1.1	2.2	2.4
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.3	2.9	2.0	1.3	2.4
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.1	1.0	1.3	1.6

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XV
Job Activities of Present College Chemistry Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.2	3.4	2.9	3.2	4.0
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.0	2.8	3.9	3.1	4.3
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	1.1	2.8	1.8	2.5	3.1
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.7	3.0	1.6	2.3	2.7
5. Advising graduate students	1.0	2.7	1.4	2.2	2.8
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.2	2.5	1.3	2.6	2.5
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.4	2.4	1.3	2.9	2.7
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	3.2	2.8	1.5	2.1	2.7
9. Conducting your own research	2.3	3.9	2.4	1.5	3.4
10. Counseling with students	2.4	2.7	1.5	1.5	2.9
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.0	3.2	1.7	2.6	3.3
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.1	2.6	1.2	1.9	2.4
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.6	2.7	1.6	2.3	2.3
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.3	3.1	1.6	2.2	2.1
15. Administration	1.6	2.7	1.3	3.1	2.8
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.6	3.7	1.7	2.0	3.3
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.7	1.0	2.2	1.9

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XVI
Job Activities of Former College Chemistry Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	2.4	3.4	3.5	2.2	3.8
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.4	2.4	3.5	3.0	3.6
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	1.3	3.1	2.1	2.7	3.1
4. Advising undergraduate students	2.1	2.5	1.7	2.9	3.7
5. Advising graduate students	1.1	3.1	1.8	2.3	3.2
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.3	2.9	1.4	2.6	3.2
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.4	2.8	1.2	2.4	3.1
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.2	3.1	1.8	2.8	4.4
9. Conducting your own research	1.3	3.7	2.6	3.0	4.1
10. Counseling with students	1.9	3.1	1.5	2.4	3.5
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.3	3.3	1.7	2.9	3.5
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.1	2.9	1.3	1.9	2.6
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.5	2.7	1.3	2.5	1.9
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.3	3.2	1.5	1.3	2.2
15. Administration	1.4	2.9	1.0	2.2	3.1
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	2.0	2.9	2.1	1.5	2.6
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.5	1.2	2.2	1.9

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XVII
Job Activities of Present University English Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.5	4.1
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.0	2.3	3.6	2.7	3.8
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.5	3.5	2.5	3.3	2.9
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.8	2.6	1.5	2.3	3.0
5. Advising graduate students	1.1	3.0	1.7	2.8	3.1
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.5	2.6	1.6	2.6	2.5
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.5	2.6	1.5	2.9	2.7
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.6	3.2	1.8	3.0	3.7
9. Conducting your own research	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.2
10. Counseling with students	1.6	2.6	1.8	2.1	2.7
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.7	4.3	2.2	4.1	4.0
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.3	2.9	1.5	2.7	2.5
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.1	2.7	1.3	1.7	1.6
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.0	2.4	1.0	2.2	1.9
15. Administration	1.6	2.5	1.3	3.2	2.5
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.4	4.1	3.0	1.9	3.1
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.1	2.7	1.2	2.1	1.9

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XVIII
Job Activities of Former University English Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	2.4	3.9	4.3	3.2	4.3
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.3	2.6	4.0	3.0	3.9
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.1	3.8	2.7	3.5	4.2
4. Advising undergraduate students	2.0	2.3	1.7	2.2	2.8
5. Advising graduate students	1.4	2.7	1.6	2.1	3.1
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.6	2.2	1.1	2.7	2.3
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.3	2.2	1.1	2.9	2.4
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.1	2.9	1.8	2.4	3.5
9. Conducting your own research	2.4	3.7	2.9	3.1	3.7
10. Counseling with students	2.1	2.4	1.7	1.7	2.6
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.5	3.1	2.7	3.3	3.7
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.4	2.3	1.1	2.2	2.3
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.3	2.4	1.3	1.6	1.6
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.2	2.8	1.3	1.8	1.8
15. Administration	1.8	2.6	1.5	2.9	2.3
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	2.2	3.6	2.7	1.5	3.1
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.5	2.2	1.4	2.1	1.8

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XIX

Job Activities of Present College English Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.3	2.8	4.1	3.2	3.8
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.2	2.8	4.2	3.2	3.9
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	1.2	3.3	1.9	2.7	4.3
4. Advising undergraduate students	2.1	2.6	2.1	2.6	2.8
5. Advising graduate students	1.1	3.1	1.2	2.8	2.6
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.5	2.5	1.4	2.3	2.2
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.7	2.0	1.6	3.1	2.7
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.2	2.7	1.3	2.3	3.3
9. Conducting your own research	1.6	4.1	2.8	2.4	3.8
10. Counseling with students	1.9	3.1	2.3	2.0	3.5
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.4	3.9	2.3	2.8	3.6
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.2	2.5	1.2	2.4	2.6
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.6	2.3	1.5	2.0	2.0
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.1	2.6	1.1	2.2	2.1
15. Administration	1.8	2.5	1.3	3.0	2.9
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	2.0	4.0	3.0	1.9	3.3
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.6	2.7	1.4	2.0	1.6

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XX

Job Activities of Former College English Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.3
2. Teaching lower division courses	4.2	2.5	4.1	2.6	2.9
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	1.4	3.8	2.0	2.8	3.4
4. Advising undergraduate students	2.1	2.8	1.8	2.3	3.4
5. Advising graduate students	1.3	3.1	1.4	2.3	2.6
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.5	2.8	1.4	1.3	2.5
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.3	2.9	1.2	2.9	2.8
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.0	3.0	1.4	1.3	3.0
9. Conducting your own research	1.8	3.9	2.6	2.6	3.1
10. Counseling with students	1.9	3.2	2.5	1.6	2.7
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.3	4.4	2.6	3.5	3.7
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.1	2.3	1.0	1.9	2.1
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.3	2.9	1.1	1.4	1.5
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.0	2.9	1.0	2.8	2.0
15. Administration	1.6	2.6	1.1	3.3	2.8
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	2.0	3.7	2.6	2.0	2.6
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.1	2.6	1.1	2.2	1.9

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XXI

Job Activities of Present University Psychology Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.0	3.7
2. Teaching lower division courses	2.5	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.6
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.3	4.0
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.5	2.8	1.7	2.0	2.6
5. Advising graduate students	1.8	2.8	1.7	2.0	2.9
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.4	2.3	1.3	2.2	2.4
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.2	2.6	1.4	2.7	2.4
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.6	3.3	2.1	2.9	3.6
9. Conducting your own research	2.3	3.8	3.4	3.8	4.3
10. Counseling with students	1.5	2.6	1.8	1.9	2.4
11. Writing professional books, articles	2.0	3.4	2.4	4.0	3.4
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.2	2.8	1.2	2.7	2.6
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.1	2.4	1.2	1.6	1.7
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.3	2.6	1.3	1.9	2.0
15. Administration	1.5	2.2	1.3	2.9	2.3
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.5	3.7	2.6	1.8	2.9
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.9	1.2	1.6	1.6

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XXII

Job Activities of Former University Psychology Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	2.9	3.2	3.2	2.4	3.7
2. Teaching lower division courses	3.1	2.6	2.3	2.7	3.4
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	2.4	3.6	3.2	2.8	4.0
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.7	2.8	2.1	2.5	3.3
5. Advising graduate students	1.6	2.7	2.8	2.4	3.8
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.3	2.3	1.6	2.7	2.7
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.6	2.7	1.4	3.3	3.0
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.2	3.2	2.0	2.7	3.6
9. Conducting your own research	2.2	4.1	3.6	3.2	3.7
10. Counseling with students	1.8	2.7	2.4	1.9	3.3
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.6	3.7	2.6	3.1	3.4
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.0	2.8	1.6	2.4	3.2
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.3	2.2	1.3	2.1	2.1
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.3	3.0	1.6	2.4	2.5
15. Administration	1.5	2.8	1.4	3.1	2.5
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	2.0	3.7	2.6	1.8	2.9
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.1	2.6	1.3	2.2	1.9

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XXIII

Job Activities of Present College Psychology Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	2.9	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.3
2. Teaching lower division courses	3.9	3.2	2.8	3.1	3.3
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	1.9	3.3	2.6	2.0	3.0
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.8	2.6	1.8	2.2	2.8
5. Advising graduate students	1.6	2.7	2.0	1.3	2.0
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.6	2.4	1.5	2.5	2.4
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.3	2.3	1.5	3.0	2.2
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.8	2.7
9. Conducting your own research	1.[illegible]	3.7	2.5	1.7	2.6
10. Counseling with students	2.2	3.3	2.0	2.1	2.6
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.3	3.3	2.0	2.8	2.7
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.3	2.1	1.5	2.0	2.1
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.4	2.6	1.5	2.5	1.8
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.2	2.4	1.0	2.3	1.6
15. Administration	1.5	2.1	1.1	3.1	2.4
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.8	3.2	1.8	1.7	2.1
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.1	1.0	2.0	1.8

See text for description of scales.

TABLE XXIV

Job Activities of Former College Psychology Teachers

Activities	*Actual Time Spent in Activity*	*Would Like To Spend Time*	*Graduate Student Expectations*	*How Administrator rates Activities*	*How Activities ought to be rated*
1. Teaching upper division courses	3.4	3.3	3.7	3.5	4.4
2. Teaching lower division courses	3.0	3.2	3.6	3.6	4.1
3. Teaching graduate courses and seminars	1.8	3.6	2.5	2.6	3.5
4. Advising undergraduate students	1.7	2.7	1.7	2.4	3.1
5. Advising graduate students	1.4	2.8	1.4	1.6	2.8
6. Serving on departmental committees	1.4	2.5	1.3	1.8	2.2
7. Serving on university or college committees	1.5	2.3	1.2	2.6	2.5
8. Supervising graduate dissertations	1.2	3.0	1.9	2.0	2.9
9. Conducting your own research	1.6	3.8	2.5	2.5	3.6
10. Counseling with students	1.8	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.5
11. Writing professional books, articles	1.4	3.9	1.9	2.8	3.5
12. Serving as an officer or committee member in your professional group(s)	1.2	2.8	1.2	2.5	2.5
13. Participating in community activities (Boy Scouts, church, PTA, etc.)	1.4	2.9	1.3	2.0	2.3
14. Consulting with industry or government	1.1	3.2	1.1	1.6	2.1
15. Administration	1.6	2.6	1.9	2.3	2.5
16. Reading professional books, articles, etc.	1.8	3.8	2.6	2.0	3.1
17. Appearing on TV or radio, writing for newspapers, etc.	1.0	2.7	1.1	1.9	2.2

See text for description of scales.

Index of Tables

Table
1 Summary of Faculty Members' Questionnaire Returns
2 Number of Administrators' Questionnaires Returned
3 Number of Interviews Conducted
4 Sample of Questionnaires Used in Data Analysis
5 Age and Family Status of Present and Former Teachers
6 Birthplaces of Present and Former Teachers and of Their Parents
7 Family Backgrounds of Present and Former Teachers
8 Family Backgrounds of Present and Former Teachers
9 Home Influences and Attitudes Toward School
10 Education and Birthplace of Present and Former Teachers' Wives
11 Religious Backgrounds and Preferences of Present and Former Teachers
12 Educational Background of Present and Former Teachers
13 Class Standing and Honors of Present and Former Teachers
14 Social Activities during Secondary School, College and Graduate School of Present and Former Teachers
15 Current Social Activities of Present and Former Teachers
16 Time and Influence Factors Involved in the Decision to Teach
17 Influences on Career Choices of Present and Former Teachers
18 Employment Histories (Teaching Record)
19 Comparisons of Highest Ranked Reward Values
20 Intercorrelations Among Selected Reward Value Categories
21 Comparative Analysis of Reward Value Structures
22 Faculty Reward Values as Reported by Administrators
23 Intercorrelations Among Reward Value Response Conditions as Rated by Administrators
24 Comparison of Faculty and Administration Rating of Values in a Teaching Career
25 Values and Rewards of Teaching Career Listed by Present Teachers
26 Values and Rewards of Teaching Career Listed by Former Teachers
27 Comparisons of Highest Ranked Job Activities by Major Field
28 Intercorrelations Among Selected Activities Scales
29 Faculty Job Activities as Reported by Administrators
30 Intercorrelations of Administrators' Ratings of Faculty Activities
31 Comparisons Between Faculty and Administrator Ratings of Activities
32 Professional and Scholarly Activities Listed by Present and Former Teachers
33 Occupational Roles and Reactions of Present and Former Teachers
34 Comparison of Fringe Benefits Available to Present and Former Teachers
35 Available Fringe Benefits as Reported by Administrators
36 Teaching Loads Reported by Present and Former Teachers in Each Major Field
37 Percent of Present and Former Teachers in Each Field Reporting Available Financial Support for Research
38 Extent of Participation in Decision Making
39 Rating of Administrative Climate by Present and Former Teachers
40 Rating of Several Aspects of Faculty Independence
41 Extent to Which Work Adjustments Are Made for Certain Special Duties

Table
42 Rating of Work Conditions by Present Teachers
43 Rating of Work Conditions by Former Teachers
44 Rating of Work Conditions by Administrators
45 Institutional Policies Affecting Faculty Members as Reported by Administrators
46 Teachers' Perceptions of the Status of Their Profession
47 Variables Affecting Present Teachers' Plans to Stay in Teaching
48 Variables Affecting Former Teachers' Decision About Teaching
49 Career Plans of Present and Former Teachers
50 Occupational Goals of College and University Teachers
51 Goal Attainment of College and University Teachers
52 Goals of Former Teachers
53 Formal Training for Teaching
54 Geographical Preferences
55 Formal Job Offers Received in Previous Year by Source
56 Informal Job Offers Received in Previous Year by Source

APPENDIX D TABLES

I Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University Chemistry Teachers
II Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Chemistry Teachers
III Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College Chemistry Teachers
IV Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College Chemistry Teachers
V Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University English Teachers
VI Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University English Teachers
VII Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College English Teachers
VIII Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College English Teachers
IX Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present University Psychology Teachers
X Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former University Psychology Teachers
XI Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Present College Psychology Teachers
XII Rewards of a Teaching Career Valued by Former College Psychology Teachers
XIII Job Activities of Present University Chemistry Teachers
XIV Job Activities of Former University Chemistry Teachers
XV Job Activities of Present College Chemistry Teachers
XVI Job Activities of Former College Chemistry Teachers
XVII Job Activities of Present University English Teachers
XVIII Job Activities of Former University English Teachers
XIX Job Activities of Present College English Teachers
XX Job Activities of Former College English Teachers
XXI Job Activities of Present University Psychology Teachers
XXII Job Activities of Former University Psychology Teachers
XXIII Job Activities of Present College Psychology Teachers
XXIV Job Activities of Former College Psychology Teachers

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, N.W. • Atlanta 13, Georgia